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Facets of Job Satisfaction and Work Engagement

1. Introduction

Work engagement is a widely researched construct that has significant links to work motivation and motivational behavior, thus, an important concept for organizations due to its positive impact on performance outcomes (Christian et al., 2011). It has been showed by the studies of both practitioners and academics that a disengaged workforce is costly (Rayton et al., 2012; Gallup, 2013). Therefore, the current focus of the literature is on identifying job- and organizational characteristics that contribute to the engagement of employees. Drawing on Social Exchange Theory, our study contributes to the literature by explaining the impact of job satisfaction facets, which are about how employees feel about various aspects of their job, on the engagement of employees in their work.

The type of employee engagement our study focuses on is work engagement, which is an independent, persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive and motivational psychological state (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli et al., 2006). Work engagement is a narrow-focused conceptualization of the relationship between the employee and his/her job (Truss et al., 2013). Every job has physical, social and organizational aspects or characteristics that motivate employees to achieve their work goals and foster personal growth, learning and development (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008). To be able to understand the link between job related characteristics and work engagement, our study focuses on the traditional job satisfaction concept and its facets.

Job satisfaction is an attitude which reflects how much an employee likes or dislikes his/her job (Spector, 1997). It requires an evaluation of the ‘emotional state’ which is a result of what an employee perceives, feels and thinks about his/her job (Weiss, 2002). It is well-established in the literature that that job satisfaction is a multi-faceted construct since
employees may have different feelings towards various aspects of their job (e.g. Smith et al., 1969; Locke, 1976; Spector, 1997). Based on Social Exchange Theory (Gouldner, 1960; Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005), we argue that satisfaction with various job characteristics or facets will be reciprocated with more positive attitudes such as work engagement.

As Rutherford et al. (2009) explain, an overall or global job satisfaction measure provides a very limited approach to understanding whether an employee is happy about their job or not. In order to accurately reflect an employee’s job satisfaction, a number of job facets need to be evaluated as these may not be of equal importance to each employee (Churchill et al., 1974; Boles et al., 2007). Thus, taking a multi-dimensional approach or considering each job satisfaction facet provides us a more detailed and complete understanding of an employee’s satisfaction in their work (Spector, 1997; Boles et al., 2007; Rutherford et al., 2009; Spagnoli et al., 2012).

The link between overall or global job satisfaction and work engagement has been explored through various studies (e.g. Saks, 2006; Avery McKay and Wilson, 2007; Bakker et al., 2008). However, to our knowledge, the multi-faceted nature of job satisfaction has not been recognized in the employee engagement literature. We are yet to understand which these of these job satisfaction facets are more likely to result in higher work engagement. By exploring job satisfaction facets-work engagement link, our study contributes to the current literature on what drives work engagement. Focusing on the long-lasting job satisfaction literature and combining it with the newly developing work engagement concept is expected to benefit organizations to understand job specific sources of employee engagement, which is an existing, continuous problem in today’s organizations.

Our model is tested by a sample from a specialist lending division of a UK bank. The engagement of service employees is a neglected area in the literature (Menguc et al., 2012). Therefore, our study further contributes to the literature by specifically focusing on the
engagement of service employees. Lastly, our cross-lagged data contributes to our understanding of long-term impact of job satisfaction facets on work engagement. As work engagement is a motivational construct (Schaufeli et al., 2002), it is important to understand which facets of job satisfaction impact motivation of employees in the long-run. In the next section, we discuss the link between job satisfaction and work engagement, and develop our hypotheses. This discussion is followed by testing of hypotheses and explanation of our results and their implications.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Work Engagement and Job Satisfaction Relationship

Work engagement is a motivational psychological state with three dimensions: vigor, dedication and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli et al., 2006). Vigor refers to energy, mental resilience, determination, and investing consistent effort in your job. Dedication is about being inspired, identified with, enthusiastic and highly involved in your job. The last dimension, absorption, refers to a sense of detachment from your surroundings, a high degree of concentration on and immersion in your job, and a general lack of conscious awareness of the amount of time spent on the job. An engaged employee, thus, is one who is energetic, enthusiastic, and absorbed in his/her job.

There are different conceptualizations of employee engagement in the literature. As defined by Kahn (1990: p.694), engagement is specifically related to the employees’ ‘presenting and absenting themselves during task performances’. In other words, it is about ‘involvement of ‘self” in the work (Kahn 1990; Meyer, Gagne and Parfyonova 2010: p. 63). Drawing on Kahn (1990; 1992)’s conceptualization of psychological presence, work engagement is explained as an ‘implied’ state and an antipode of burnout (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Recent studies, however, separate burnout and engagement as independent psychological states (e.g. Schaufeli et al., 2006; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008). Furthermore,
Saks (2006) focuses on job and organizational engagement of employees and it is one of the first studies that focus on engagement directed towards a factor other than the work. While Macey and Schneider (2008) provide a more comprehensive model by differentiating among state, trait and behavioral aspects of engagement; this model has not been empirically tested probably due to its complexity. A more recent conceptualization is job engagement (Rich et al., 2010), which also draws on the psychological presence similar to work engagement and has three dimensions as physical, emotional and cognitive engagement. Finally, Soane et al. (2012) discuss ISA, which stands for intellectual, social and affective, engagement. Among all these different conceptualizations, work engagement is the only one that has received the most empirical support by its validation across various contexts and counties as well as the extensive discussion in the academic literature.

Our study argues that satisfaction with various job aspects is important for employees to become energetic, dedicated and absorbed in their job. By taking this view we agree that (a) job satisfaction and work engagement are distinct concepts, which is in-line with the existing literature (e.g. Schaufeli 2013) (b) job satisfaction is an antecedent of work engagement. The discussion on whether job satisfaction is an antecedent or an outcome of work engagement is still debated. There is support for both views. Some studies argue that job satisfaction is an outcome (e.g. Saks, 2006; Avery, et al., 2007; Vecina, Chacon, Suerio and Barron, 2012) while other studies explain that job satisfaction is an antecedent of work engagement (e.g. Simpson 2009; Rayton and Yalabik 2014; Salanova, Llorens and Schaufeli 2011; Yalabik et al. 2013).

Our first reason to view job satisfaction as the antecedent of work engagement is about the satiation-activation differentiation. Job satisfaction is an emotional evaluation of the job and is linked to the satiation state (Macey and Schneider, 2008) while work engagement is a motivational state and linked to activation (Macey and Schneider, 2008; Salanova et al.,
2011). This means that once employees have evaluated their job, they are ready (or not, if they are not satisfied) to move into a motivational state i.e. become engaged. Next, drawing on Social Exchange Theory, Seers et al. (1995) suggest that the reciprocity-based relationship between an organization and its employees predict positive work attitudes in the veil of job satisfaction. Therefore, when employees are satisfied with various facets of their job, they may then provide the organization with increased levels of work engagement. Moreover, considering that work engagement is emerged from the burnout concept as its antipode (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008), we follow the same directionality between job satisfaction and burnout. It is well-established that job satisfaction is an antecedent of burnout (Lee and Ashforth, 1996); thus, job satisfaction is also more likely to be the antecedent of work engagement.

2.2. Facets of Job Satisfaction

Social Exchange Theory is the theoretical framework adopted to explain the relationship between facets of job satisfaction, and work engagement in our study. The key principle of Social Exchange Theory is the norm of reciprocity (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). The social exchange signifies the expectation that when one person does a favor, this favor will be returned in the future (Aryee et al., 2002). Drawing on Blau (1964), the organization in order to initiate the exchange has to provide resources that are valuable to the employees (Molm et al., 2003; Cole et al., 2002). These resources provided by the organization entail an obligation on the part of the employees to reciprocate with more positive personal attitudes and positive behaviors to the organization (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005; Aryee et al., 2002; Eisenberger et al., 2001; McNeely and Meglino, 1994; Haas and Deseran, 1981; Etzioni, 1961). The organization may initiate exchange by offering resources to the employees who enjoy higher levels of satisfaction with various job facets and will reciprocate with higher levels of work engagement. Alternatively, employees may initiate exchange by perceiving
these resources valuable and they are satisfied with facets of their job. Put differently, as employee expectations about job conditions and rewards are satisfied by their organization, the organizations, in return, receive positive attitudinal and behavioral outcomes reciprocity which creates an exchange relationship between employees and organizations (Settoon et al., 1996). Thus, we argue that when the employees are satisfied with various aspects of their job, they are more likely to reciprocate by becoming more engaged in their job.

One stream of researchers focus on a global job satisfaction measure while the others argue that different facets of a job might create satisfaction or dissatisfaction for employees (Weiss, 2002; Bowling, Hendricks and Wagner, 2008). It is supported that each facet significantly contributes to overall job satisfaction of employees (Skalli et al., 2008; Spagnoli et al., 2012). Job satisfaction is stable overtime and facets are important indicators of an overall job satisfaction (Spagnoli et al., 2012).

In this study, we adopt nine job satisfaction facets proposed by Spector (1997) as satisfaction with: nature of work, operating conditions, pay, benefits, rewards, promotion, supervisor, co-workers and communication. Spector (1997)’s categorization of job satisfaction facets and his scale is one of the most reliable scales in the literature (Spagnoli et al., 2012). Table 1 presents the facets of job satisfaction discussed and measured in our study, which is consistent with Spector (1997)’s categorization.

---

Table 1 here.

---

The first job satisfaction facet is the nature of work. Previous research indicates that the characteristics of a job impact an employee’s affective state, which in return impacts behavior towards the job. Employees who find their jobs more psychologically meaningful are found to be more engaged (Kahn, 1990; May et al., 2004). Earlier engagement studies argue that favorable job characteristics will lead to higher employee engagement (Saks, 2006; Schaufeli
et al., 2008). Alternatively, as discussed, satisfaction with work is measured in the form of overall job satisfaction, which is positively linked to employee engagement (Saks, 2006; Alarcon and Lyons, 2011; Tims et al., 2013). Similarly, we argue that:

**Hypothesis 1: Satisfaction with the nature of work will be positively related to work engagement.**

The second dimension, satisfaction with operating conditions, has not been analyzed in previous engagement studies. However, workload, or work overload concepts are similar to the concept Spector (1997) named as operating conditions. Workload or work overload occurs when job demands exceed individual capabilities; hence, workload is seen as a challenge stressor (Podsakoff et al., 2007; van den Broeck et al., 2010). Workload is positively related to burnout’s exhaustion dimension, which is conceptualized as the opposite of the dedication dimension (Maslach and Leiter, 2008). Workload is also shown to be negatively linked to work engagement as a job demand (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Bakker and Demerouti, 2008; Crawford et al., 2010; Cole et al., 2012; Tims et al., 2013). It is argued that not all demands are negative and employees with reasonable job demands are found to be more energetic in their jobs (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). Thus, we expect that employees who are satisfied with their workload should have higher work engagement.

**Hypothesis 2: Satisfaction with operating conditions will be positively related to work engagement.**

Our next set of hypotheses is related to pay satisfaction, benefits satisfaction, promotion satisfaction, and rewards satisfaction. To our knowledge, only a recent study by Hulkko-Nyman et al. (2012) specifically focuses on the relationship between work engagement and a comprehensive view of pay, benefits, promotion and rewards. Hulkko-Nyman et al. (2012) find that non-monetary rewards, more precisely appreciation of work, are significant positive
predictors of vigor, dedication and absorption. Furthermore, their study shows that compared to other dimensions, benefits is the main one that is strongly related to the dedication of employees.

Traditionally, pay or compensation in one’s job has been considered as the most important aspect of an employee’s satisfaction (Deckop, 1992). However, the pay level is not a strong predictor of job satisfaction (Spector, 1997), though it does impact other work attitudes such as organizational commitment and intention to stay (Chew and Chan, 2008), and pay satisfaction (Heneman et al., 1997). Moreover, Herzberg et al., (2011) suggest that job satisfaction is determined by “motivators” such as job content, recognition, achievement, responsibilities, advancement and opportunities; whereas, job dissatisfaction is influenced by “hygiene factors” such as salary and working conditions, which also shows a weak relationship between pay and job satisfaction.

Bakker et al. (2006) find that financial rewards are negatively related to perceptions of work engagement, although satisfaction with fringe benefits is positively related to work engagement. On the other hand, Gorter et al. (2008) show that financial rewards are positively related to work engagement. In addition, Fairlie (2011) does not find any link between extrinsic rewards, which is measured as combinations of fair pay, perks and other rewards for one’s efforts, and work engagement. A meta-analysis study by Crawford et al. (2010)’s suggests that the relationship between rewards and engagement can be either positive or negative since extrinsic rewards, such as pay, may damage intrinsic motivation. Therefore, while rewards are important job characteristics that contribute to work engagement, further research is needed to understand their impact on engagement (Crawford et al., 2013).

Only a few studies consider promotion aspect as part of job characteristics and work engagement relationship. de Lange et al. (2008) examine the difference between employees who stayed in their job, promoted or left rather than focusing on promotion perceptions of
employees. They find that there is a positive relationship between job resources and work engagement of the employees who have been recently promoted. Moreover, Balducci et al. (2011) find that promotion prospects (combined with job autonomy and social aspects) is positively related to work engagement; however, the individual impact of promotion prospects on work engagement is not specified. Recent changes to the employment relationship may mean that employees are more interested in career advancements in their job (Sullivan and Baruch, 2009), thus, increasing the importance of satisfaction with promotion opportunities.

Lastly, improved rewards have been linked to work engagement (Demerouti et al., 2001; Koyuncu et al., 2006; Maslach and Leiter, 2008; Crawford et al., 2010). All these previous studies view rewards as part of job which positively contribute to work engagement of employees. Drawing from Social Exchange Theory, when employees are satisfied with the rewards offered by their organization, they are expected to reciprocate with positive attitudes such as work engagement. Therefore, we hypothesize that:

**Hypothesis 3:** Satisfaction with pay will be positively related to work engagement.

**Hypothesis 4:** Satisfaction with benefits will be positively related to work engagement.

**Hypothesis 5:** Satisfaction with promotion will be positively related to work engagement.

**Hypothesis 6:** Satisfaction with rewards will be positively related to work engagement.

In the work engagement literature, satisfaction with co-workers and supervisor/line-manager are categorized as ‘social support’ under the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model. Social support is one of the mostly researched job resources in JD-R model (Bakker et al., 2004; Saks, 2006; de Lange et al., 2008; Fairlie, 2011; van den Broeck et al., 2011; Cole et
al., 2012; van Beek et al., 2012; Mastenbroek et al., 2014), and it is measured in a variety of ways across studies. One group of studies uses a specific social support scale that includes both coworker and supervisor/line-manager support (Bakker et al., 2004; de Lange et al., 2008). Other set of studies differentiate between coworker and supervisor/line-manager support (Saks 2006; Fairlie 2011; van den Broeck et al., 2011; Cole et al., 2012; van Beek et al., 2012; Mastenbroek et al., 2014;).

Social aspects of the work environment, for example, having friendly and supportive colleagues, has a significant impact on employee job perceptions (Chalofsky, 2003). Co-workers and supervisor/line-manager play important roles in various types of information acquisition, etc., and employees may become detached from their jobs if supervisor/line-manager are not perceived to be available and responsive (Lapalme et al., 2009). Thus, social support from co-workers and supervisor/line-manager has been linked to increased work engagement (Demerouti et al., 2001; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Bakker et al., 2007; Bakker and Demerouti, 2007; Freeney and Fellenz, 2013).

Social Exchange Theory helps us to explain why “support” is reciprocated by increased positive attitudes such as engagement. Reciprocity not only ensures repaying, rather it creates a stronger and more solid relationship between the employee and the organization (Rousseau, 1995). In that sense, individuals seek to reciprocate so as to enhance the receipt of future resources and, hence, maintain the exchange relationship. Therefore, the exchanged resources signal the appearance of mutual support and maintenance of long-term relationships among the organizational members (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005; Aryee et al., 2002). According to Social Exchange Theory, employees reciprocate the care/support their organizations show with more effort and positive attitudes (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). Thus, we hypothesize that employees who are satisfied in their interactions with their co-workers and supervisors/line-managers will be more engaged with their work.
Hypothesis 7: Satisfaction with coworkers will be positively related to work engagement.

Hypothesis 8: Satisfaction with line-managers will be positively related to work engagement.

Our last hypothesis relates to communication satisfaction facet. Communication contributes to the development of employee trust in organizations (Thomas et al., 2009). Communication satisfaction is an important contributory factor in the interaction between employees and their job environment, and it is linked with positive employee attitudes such as organizational identification (Postmes et al., 2001). While the importance of communication has been linked to engagement in practitioner based sources (MacLeod and Clarke, 2009), the academic research has been slow to show such relationship.

May et al. (2004) explain the importance of open communication as a factor that contributes to supervisor support and impacts perceptions of supervisors. Similarly, Fairlie (2011) includes communication as part of leadership and organizational features as well as organizational support, however, there is not a direct linkage shown between communication and work engagement. Iyer and Israel (2012)’s study has an extensive focus on communication satisfaction and engagement, which is defined and measured as the combination of commitment, satisfaction and withdrawal cognition of employees. They find that communication satisfaction has a positive significant impact on employee engagement. Furthermore, Vogelgesang et al. (2013) show that communication transparency, as part of the perceptions of leader behavioral integrity, and followers’ work engagements have been positively related. Lastly, Rees et al. (2013) find a direct relationship between perceptions of voice behavior and job engagement. While there are a few studies in the current literature on communication and engagement, no specific study focused on communication satisfaction and work engagement. Again drawing on Social Exchange Theory, we expect that employees
who have high communication satisfaction are more likely to be engaged in their work.

*Hypothesis 9: Satisfaction with communication will be positively related to work engagement.*

3. Methodology

Our data comes from employees in the specialist lending division of a UK bank. In this division, the employees provide a service for the provision of non-standard mortgage products as well as self-employed applicants. The employees are involved in the processing and approval of applications generated through the retail branch network of the bank rather than directly dealing with customers. We collected our data via paper-based questionnaires in August 2009 and repeated the survey in August 2010. All 520 employees in the specialist lending division received our questionnaire. In 2009, 377 surveys were returned (73%). As a result of the second data collection, we had 202 repeat respondents. However, due to the missing data, the final dataset decreases to 175 in the regression analyses (34% final response rate). While the sample available for analysis is contingent on missing data, missing values analyses revealed no patterns to the missing observations.

To be able to answer our survey, the employees were given time-off during their work. We asked respondents their employee numbers to be able to match the surveys across time. To be able to protect the confidentiality of the respondents, pre-paid envelopes were provided so that the respondents would be able to return the completed survey directly to the authors. In addition, the three randomly selected respondents were identified and provided monetary incentives1. As supported by Newby *et al.* (2003), monetary incentives positively contribute survey response rate and quality data without introducing bias.

3.1 Measures

This section explains our dependent, independent and control variables. Unless otherwise
indicated, dependent and independent variables are measured by using a 7-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree). All constructs pass confirmatory factor-analytic tests for unidimensionality. All hypotheses are tested via Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Regression analyses. In the regression analyses, all job satisfaction facets related scales are measured in Time 1 (i.e. August 2009) while the work engagement measure comes from the second-wave of our data i.e. Time 2 (August 2010).

3.1.1. Dependent Variable: Work Engagement

Work engagement is measured by the seventeen-item version of Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) (Schaufeli et al., 2006). The work engagement is measured during Time 2.

Vigor is measured by six items ($\alpha= 0.84$). A sample item is, “When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.” Dedication is measured by five items ($\alpha= 0.92$). A sample item is, “I am enthusiastic about my job.” The third work engagement dimension, absorption, is measured by six items ($\alpha= 0.87$). A sample item is, “When I am working, I forget everything else around me.”

3.1.2 Facets of Job Satisfaction

To measure facets of job satisfaction, we have used Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) developed by Spector (1997) (please see Table 1 for items). All independent variables (i.e. job satisfaction facets) are measured during Time 1.

Table 1 here.

For operating conditions facet, we had to drop one of the items i.e. “My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape” due to low reliability score. In addition, although Spector (1997) originally implemented the supervision facet with the term “supervisor”, our investigation of the organizational structure of the company we collected our data from
indicated that the term “line manager” was used. In order to avoid confusing respondents, we
replaced the term supervisor with line-manager in our survey questions. Since there were
many different departments in this organization, there were enough line managers to generate
variance.

Descriptive statistics, correlations and reliability statistics for both dependent and
independent variables are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 here.

3.1.3 Control Variables

With the permission of respondents, we provided a list of employee numbers to the
company in order to obtain detailed demographic information. The company was not
provided any survey responses for obvious ethical reasons. We used this data to construct age,
gender, tenure, and job level controls, all of which have been found to be important contextual
factors in the measurement of employee attitudes. Age and tenure are continuous variables
based on birthdates and dates of initial employment with the company. Gender is a dummy
variable which equals one for women and zero for men.

Job level captures the position of the employee in the company hierarchy. There are three
job levels among respondents: non-managerial, front line managers and senior managers, each
corresponding to a salary band. We excluded all nine responses from senior managers in the
interests of comparability, though our results are unaffected by this choice. The front line
managers represent the first tier of management above the entry level, and we have retained
them in the sample because the majority of their day-to-day tasks are the same as those of the
people they lead. As a result, we include a job level dummy variable equaling one for the 70%
of our sample who are non-managerial employees.
4. Analyses and Results

Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression is the method used to run our analyses via SPSS 22 statistical analyses software. We conducted separate regression analyses on our three dependent variables (i.e. vigour, dedication and absorption) in order to evaluate their relationships with each job satisfaction facet. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 here.

The first hypothesis stated that satisfaction with the ‘Nature of Work’ would be positively related to work engagement. We see that ‘satisfaction with work itself’ is a positive predictor of vigor ($\beta=0.570, p<0.01$), dedication ($\beta=0.548, p<0.01$) and absorption ($\beta=0.483, p<0.01$)$^2$. These results provide full support for hypothesis 1. The hypothesis 2 is about the satisfaction with operating conditions. The way satisfaction with operating conditions is measured means that higher scores mean low satisfaction with operating conditions. In other words, higher scores mean high workload. Our results show that ‘Satisfaction with workload’ is inversely related to absorption ($\beta=-0.232, p<0.01$). We conclude that hypothesis 2 is partially supported as there is no relationship of satisfaction with operating conditions with vigour and dedication.

For the rest of our hypotheses we find no support. For hypothesis 3, there is no support for the link between pay satisfaction and vigour ($\beta=0.015, p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta=-0.059, p<0.00$), and absorption ($\beta=-0.045, p<0.00$). Hypothesis 4 is not supported, and our analyses show that there is no significant relationship between benefits satisfaction and vigour ($\beta=-0.012, p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta=-0.012, p<0.00$), and absorption ($\beta=-0.007, p<0.00$). Hypothesis 5, which is about promotion-work engagement link, is not supported. There is no link between promotion and vigour ($\beta=-0.026, p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta=-0.027, p<0.00$), and absorption ($\beta=-0.035, p<0.00$). Lastly, there is no support for the relationship between...
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rewards and vigour ($\beta$=-0.06, $p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta$=0.101, $p<0.00$), and absorption ($\beta$=0.045, $p<0.00$) i.e. no support for hypothesis 6.

We did not find any statistically significant relationships between work engagement and satisfaction with co-workers (i.e. hypotheses 7) and vigour ($\beta$=-0.053, $p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta$=-0.015, $p<0.00$), and absorption ($\beta$=0.010, $p<0.00$). There is no support for the relationship between satisfaction with line-managers (i.e. hypotheses 8) and vigour ($\beta$=-0.037, $p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta$=-0.069, $p<0.00$) and absorption ($\beta$=-0.123, $p<0.00$). The final hypothesis, i.e. satisfaction with communication (hypothesis 9), is partially supported. Our results show no link between satisfaction with communication and vigour ($\beta$=0.099 $p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta$=0.042, $p<0.00$), and absorption ($\beta$=0.182, $p<0.05$). Our finding means that the employees who are satisfied with the communication in their job are more absorbed in their work.

Considering that nine job satisfaction facets are correlated with each other, we also tested for multi-collinearity in our regression analyses. The tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) scores, which are indicators of multi-collinearity, are calculated in SPPS and presented in Table 4. It is accepted that tolerance scores that are under 0.10 (e.g., Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001) and VIF scores over 10 are problematic (Neter, Wasserman, & Kutner, 1989). The multi-collinearity scores of tolerance and VIF in Table 4 do not fall in the undesired levels. Thus, we conclude that multi-collinearity is not a problem in our regression analyses.

Table 4 here.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of our study is to understand the impact of job satisfaction facets on work engagement. Our results show that ‘satisfaction with work itself’ is a key driver of all dimensions of work engagement i.e. vigor, dedication and absorption. In addition,
‘satisfaction with operating conditions’ (i.e. high workload) is negatively related to absorption of employees in their work. Finally, our results show that ‘satisfaction with communication is negatively linked to the absorption of employees in their work.

Our study contributes to our understanding about the drivers of work engagement. The key concepts were drawn from work engagement and well-established job satisfaction literatures to explore the relationship between the job satisfaction perceptions of employees and their work engagement. While the JD-R model has been frequently tested in the literature, none of the previous studies provided a systematic and complete reflection of job characteristics and discussed their impact on work engagement. Thus, by drawing on the well-established job satisfaction concept and its facets, we expand the JD-R model and observe the impact job satisfaction facets have on the work engagement of service employees. Barnes and Collier (2013) find that job satisfaction has significant impact on work engagement compared to service environment and affective commitment. Considering the challenges faced by employees in the service sector, work engagement is harder to achieve and worth exploring in the service context (Menguc et al., 2012). Thus, our study also contributes to the limited number of studies that focus on work engagement of service sector employees in UK. Lastly, the longitudinal dimension of our study helps us to understand the impact of which job satisfaction facets on work engagement continue in the long-run, and helps us to avoid common method bias in our results.

The first part of our results indicates that when employees are satisfied with the work, they are more likely to become engaged. This finding supports a social exchange perspective and specifically the norm of reciprocity. In other words, employees who are satisfied with their work will display more vigor, dedication and absorption. Our findings suggest that organizations that care about employee well-being; consider employee goals, values and opinions; and help employees with the problems they face will have employees who are
energetic, enthusiastic and captivated in their jobs, and who are engaged with the whole organization.

Satisfaction with work itself is a main facet employees use to evaluate their job (Skalli et al., 2008). Our finding is in-line with the previous research as satisfaction with work facet is positively linked to vigor, dedication, and absorption of employees. Finding meaning in work comes from the interaction between the internal world of employees and the external context of the workplace (Cartwright and Holmes, 2006; Chalofsky and Krishna, 2009), but the work itself is argued to be the strongest predictor of meaning in the workplace and the main motivator for employees (Chalofsky, 2003). Work is a source of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, both of which are about exerting effort, persistence and energy towards a specific goal (Katzell and Thompson, 1990). In work, the task content, the activities performed and the fulfilment of personal needs drives employees. Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation are closely related to the vigor and dedication dimensions of work engagement (Bakker et al., 2008). Our results support these previous studies.

Following the same discussion, our study shows that the employees who perceived their workload as high (i.e. satisfaction with operating conditions), are less likely to be absorbed in their work. That is also in line with the previous literature. However, the previous studies that consider the workload as a job demand mostly focus on the overall work engagement. Our study shows that its relationship is only with the absorption dimension. This finding implies that absorption and how it is impacted by workload should be considered in more detail. It might be that having high workload might act as a distraction for the employees and decrease their absorption in their work due to the worry and/or stress it creates.

Finally, our study shows that satisfaction with communication is positively linked to absorption of the employees in their work. As discussed in the literature section, satisfaction with communication has been the focus of only a few previous studies in terms of its
relationship to employee engagement, not specifically work engagement. Alternatively, the way communication defined is different from what we find in our study. Therefore, to our knowledge, our study is the first study that considers the link between satisfaction with communication facet and work engagement. We find that satisfaction with communication is positively linked to the absorption of employees in their work. This means that clarity with what is going on in the organization helps employees to be immersed in their work.

Our results did not find any support about the link between satisfaction with pay and work engagement, which is in line with the previous literature. We can conclude that pay satisfaction is a hygiene factor as discussed in the literature (e.g. Herzberg et al., 2011). Similarly, satisfaction with benefits is not found to be linked to work engagement. As benefits satisfaction has not been explored much in the work engagement literature, there is need for more studies to understand how benefits satisfaction is linked to work engagement. The link between satisfaction with rewards and work engagement is an under-researched area as discussed. Our study does not show any linkages between rewards satisfaction and individual dimensions of work engagement. We also could not find any relationship between promotion satisfaction and work engagement dimensions. Considering the limited previous research in the area, our study might be a starting point but there is definitely need for further research as todays employees are very much interested in promotion opportunities (Sullivan and Baruch, 2009).

As explained, line manager support and coworker support are combined as ‘social support’ job resource in previous work engagement studies. There is no unified way of measuring or defining social support. In this study, we specifically focused on satisfaction with co-workers and satisfaction with line managers. It is surprising that our results do not show any support for the link between coworker or line-manager support and individual dimensions of work engagement. There is definitely need to unwrap the dynamics of coworker or line-manager
support and work engagement in the future studies.

The results of our study have important implications for organizations. Understanding sources of satisfaction for service sector employees might help organizations about under which conditions to expect engagement from their employees. Engaged employees are more likely to stay with their organizations (Saks, 2006), and a disengaged workforce might lead to higher costs associated with higher turnover, lower productivity, eroded psychological well-being and poor physical health (Ruhlman and Siegman, 2009). Our findings suggest that the nature of work, promotion opportunities and pay satisfaction are important aspects organizations should consider to manage these costs.

As with all studies, ours has limitations. Generalization of our results is difficult since the data are from a single UK company in the service sector, though we note that our results are consistent with those found by other researchers where comparisons are possible. Future studies might apply our theoretical model to other contexts. For example, job satisfaction facets and work engagement link might be tested to compare of service sector employees to employees in other industries. As the work conditions differ among sectors, the facets that shape employees’ engagement might differ across sectors. Such comparison is yet to be provided in the literature. Furthermore, Skalli et al., (2008) argue that differences in economic and cultural aspects across countries might shape the impact of job satisfaction facets on employee attitudes. Therefore, future studies might also focus on expanding our results to different country contexts.

Notes:

1. The three prizes were for £250, £100 and £50 in cash, respectively.
2. $\beta$ is the standardized regression coefficient.
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Facets of Job Satisfaction and Work Engagement: Expansion of Job Resources

1. Introduction

Work engagement is a widely researched construct that has significant links to work motivation and motivational behavior, thus, an important concept for organizations due to its positive impact on performance outcomes (Christian et al., 2011). It has been showed by the studies of both practitioners and academics that a disengaged workforce is costly (Rayton et al., 2012; Gallup, 2013). Therefore, the current studies have focused on identifying work-related and organizational factors that contribute to the engagement of employees. Drawing on Social Exchange Theory, our study contributes to the literature by explaining the impact of job satisfaction facets, which are about how employees feel about various aspects of their job, on the engagement of employees in their work.

The type of employee engagement our study focuses on is work engagement, which is an independent, persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive and motivational psychological state with three dimensions: vigor, dedication and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli et al., 2006). Vigor refers to energy, mental resilience, determination, and investing consistent effort in your job. Dedication is about being inspired, identified with, enthusiastic and highly involved in your job. The last dimension, absorption, refers to a sense of detachment from your surroundings, a high degree of concentration on and immersion in your job, and a general lack of conscious awareness of the amount of time spent on the job. An engaged employees, thus, is one who is energetic, enthusiastic, and absorbed in his/her job.

Work engagement is a more narrow-focused and precise conceptualization of the relationship between the employee and his or her job (Truss et al., 2013). Every job has physical, social and organizational aspects or characteristics that motivate employees to
achieve their work goals and foster personal growth, learning and development (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008). To be able to understand the link between job related characteristics and work engagement, our study focuses on the traditional job satisfaction concept and its facets.

Job satisfaction is an attitude which reflects how much an employee likes or dislikes his/her job (Spector, 1997). It requires an evaluation of the ‘emotional state’ which is a result of what an employee perceives, feels and thinks about his/her job (Weiss, 2002). It is well-established in the literature that that job satisfaction is a multi-faceted construct since employees may have different feelings towards various aspects of their job (e.g. Smith et al., 1969; Locke, 1976; Spector, 1997). Based on Social Exchange Theory (Gouldner, 1960; Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005), our study argues we argue that satisfaction with various job characteristics or facets will be reciprocated with more positive attitudes such as work engagement.

One of the theoretical frameworks for this relationship draws might be based from on Social Exchange Theory since as such that, Within a social exchange perspective, the positive exchange of resources perception of physical, social and organizational aspects of a job will induce to be reciprocated with employees the feeling to reciprocate with more positive attitudes such as work engagement (Gouldner, 1960; Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005).

Three aspects of jobs, i.e. job autonomy, feedback and social support, are considered extensively in relation to work engagement (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008). The most extensively adopted model in the work engagement literature is the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model. Job resources are about the physical, social and organizational aspects of the job that motivate employees to achieve their work goals and foster personal growth, learning and development (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008). Employees who possess job-related resources are motivated to deal with the demands of their job (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). Within a social exchange perspective, the exchange of resources will induce to employees the
feeling to reciprocate with more positive attitudes such as work engagement (Gouldner, 1960; Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). The current studies in the engagement literature reflect job resources as job autonomy, job control, feedback and social support (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008). However, there is no systematic definition of job resources characteristics across these studies except the job autonomy and feedback aspects. In every study, a different combination of resources job characteristics is adopted and reflected as job resources, however, these combinations do not necessarily provide a complete reflection of job characteristics related aspects.

in which work engagement is an outcome of various job related characteristics that can be classified in two categories: job demands and job resources (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008; Demerouti et al., 2001). The JD-R model explains that the availability of job resources prompts a motivational process, which results in higher work engagement (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007). In other words, employees who possess job related resources are motivated to deal with the demands of their job (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). This motivational role of job resources is also confirmed by the Job Characteristics Theory (JCT; Hackman and Oldham, 1980; Hackman and Lawler, 1971). The JCT suggests that five core job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and job feedback) promote meaningfulness, experienced responsibility and knowledge of results which subsequently create positive attitudes and behaviours at work (Bakker et al., 2010). However, the JCT is not part of the engagement theory and models but it is recognised for the influence it has had on thinking about the way employees relate to their tasks.

Job resources are about the physical, social and organizational aspects of the job that motivate employees to achieve their work goals and foster personal growth, learning and development (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008). The current studies in the engagement literature reflect job resources as job autonomy, job control, feedback and social support (Bakker and
However, there is no systematic definition of job resources across these studies except for the job autonomy and feedback aspects. In every study, a different combination of resources is adopted and reflected as job resources, however, these combinations do not necessarily provide a complete reflection of job characteristics.

To be able to understand the link between job-related aspects and work engagement, our study focuses on the traditional job satisfaction concept and its facets. Job satisfaction is an attitude which reflects how much an employee likes or dislikes his/her job (Spector, 1997). It requires an evaluation of the ‘emotional state’ which is a result of what an employee perceives, feels and thinks about his/her job (Weiss, 2002). As defined by Spagnoli et al. (2012: 609), job satisfaction is a construct with “major implications as it is multidisciplinary and everlasting construct covering all professions, work, jobs and contexts” (Spagnoli et al., 2012: 609). Thus, the multi-dimensional approach may also offer both academics and managers more benefits as far as the creation of work engagement is concerned (Rutherford et al., 2009; Spector, 1997).

Job satisfaction is an attitude which reflects how much an employee likes or dislikes his/her job (Spector, 1997). It requires an evaluation of the ‘emotional state’ which is a result of what an employee perceives, feels and thinks about his/her job (Weiss, 2002). To be able to be satisfied, the employees must have their needs to be fulfilled (Porter, 1962). These needs are closely related to the various aspects of their job and work environment (Weiss, 2002). If the organizations would like to have engaged employees, then the employees first must be content that their needs related to their job and work environment are fulfilled.

It is accepted established that job satisfaction is a multi-faceted or else a higher-order construct since employees may have different feelings towards various aspects of their job (Smith et al., 1969; Locke, 1976; Spector, 1997). As Rutherford et al. (2009) explain, an overall or global job satisfaction measure provides a very limited approach to understanding
whether an employee is happy about their job or not. In order to accurately measure an employee’s job satisfaction, a number of job aspects or facets need to be evaluated as these may not be of equal importance to each employee individual (Churchill et al., 1974; Boles et al., 2007). Therefore, specifically, various aspects of a job may be evaluated in a different way (Boles et al., 2007) and although all facets are important, each of these facets may influence the job satisfaction outcomes, such as work engagement, differently. Taking a multi-dimensional approach or considering various facets of job satisfaction, however, provides us a more detailed and complete understanding of an employee’s satisfaction in their work (Spector, 1997; Boles et al., 2007; Rutherford et al., 2009; Spagnoli et al., 2012).

The link between overall or global job satisfaction and work engagement has been explored through various studies (e.g. Saks, 2006; Avery McKay and Wilson, et al., 2007; Bakker et al., 2008). However, to our knowledge, the multi-faceted nature of job satisfaction has not been recognized in the employee engagement literature. Thus, the multi-dimensional approach may also offer both academics and managers more benefits as far as the creation of work engagement is concerned (Rutherford et al., 2009; Spector, 1997). By drawing on Social Exchange Theory, we argue that employees who are satisfied with various facets of their jobs will reciprocate with higher engagement in their work. However, to our knowledge, a systematic analysis of job satisfaction facets and work engagement has not been conducted in the current literature—yet to understand which of these job satisfaction facets are more likely to result in higher work engagement.

Our study explains the impact of ‘satisfaction with job aspects’ or ‘job satisfaction facets’ on work engagement. We draw on JD-R model and Social Exchange Theory (SET) to explain this relationship. By exploring this link between job satisfaction facets—work engagement link, we expand our study contributes to our current understanding of which job related aspects drive employee work engagement. In that sense, employees who have at
their disposal job resources, they are likely to be more satisfied with job related aspects, to deal better with demands and exhaustion and will become more engaged in their job.

The link between overall job satisfaction and engagement has been explored through various studies (Saks, 2006; Avery et al., 2007; Bakker et al., 2008). However, the multi-faceted nature of job satisfaction has not been recognized in the employee engagement literature. Few studies that rely on JD-R model explain a few facets of job satisfaction, such as job autonomy, rewards, recognition and social support (Koyuncu et al., 2006; Maslach and Leiter, 2008). However, other facets of job satisfaction related to different job aspects have not been considered in previous studies. Moreover, as discussed, there is not a coherent grouping of job resources. Focusing on the long-lasting job satisfaction literature and combining it with the newly developing work engagement concept is expected to benefit organizations to understand job specific sources of employee engagement, which is an existing, continuous problem in today’s organizations.

Our model is tested by a sample from a specialist lending division of a UK bank. The engagement of service employees is a neglected area in the literature (Menguc et al., 2012). Therefore, our study further contributes to the literature by specifically focusing on the engagement of service employees. Lastly, our longitudinal cross-lagged data contributes to our understanding of long-term impact of job satisfaction facets on work engagement. As work engagement is a motivational construct (Schaufeli et al., 2002), it is important to understand which facets of job satisfaction impact motivation of employees in the long-run.

In the next section, we discuss the link between job satisfaction and work engagement, and develop our hypotheses. This discussion is followed by testing of hypotheses and explanation of our results and their implications.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Work Engagement and Job Satisfaction and Work Engagement Relationship
Work engagement is a motivational psychological state with three dimensions: vigor, dedication and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli et al., 2006). Vigor refers to energy, mental resilience, determination, and investing consistent effort in your job. Dedication is about being inspired, identified with, enthusiastic and highly involved in your job. The last dimension, absorption, refers to a sense of detachment from your surroundings, a high degree of concentration on and immersion in your job, and a general lack of conscious awareness of the amount of time spent on the job. An engaged employee, thus, is one who is energetic, enthusiastic, and absorbed in his/her job.

There are different conceptualizations of employee engagement in the literature. As defined by Kahn (1990: p.694), engagement is specifically related to the employees’ ‘presenting and absenting themselves during task performances’. In other words, it is about ‘involvement of “self” in the work (Kahn 1990; Meyer, Gagne and Parfyonova 2010: p. 63). As defined by Kahn (1990: p.694), engagement is specifically related to the employees’ ‘presenting and absenting themselves during task performances’. In other words, it is about ‘involvement of “self” in the work (Kahn 1990). As defined by Kahn (1990: p.694), engagement is specifically related to the employees’ ‘presenting and absenting themselves during task performances’. In other words, it is about ‘involvement of “self” in the work (Kahn 1990). Drawing on Kahn (1990; 1992)’s conceptualization of psychological presence, work engagement was developed and explained as an ‘implied’ state and an antipode of burnout (Schaufeli et al., 2002). However, recent studies, however, separate burnout and engagement as independent psychological states (e.g. Schaufeli et al., 2006; Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008). Furthermore.

There exist different conceptualisation of employee engagement also exist in the literature. Saks (2006) focuses on job and organizational engagement of employees and it is one of the first studies that focus on engagement directed towards a factor
other than the work. While Macey and Schneider (2008) provide a more comprehensive model by differentiating among state, trait and behavioral aspects of engagement; however, this model has not been empirically tested probably due to its complexity. A more recent conceptualisation is job engagement (Rich et al., 2010), which also draws on the psychological presence similar to work engagement and has three dimensions as physical, emotional and cognitive engagement. Finally, Soane et al. (2012) discuss ISA, which stands for intellectual, social and affective, engagement. Among all these different conceptualisations, work engagement is the only concept that has received the most empirical support by its validation across various contexts and countries and as well as the extensive discussion in the academic literature.

Saks (2006) focus on job and organizational engagement of employees. Work engagement is the most validated and empirically supported conceptualization of employee engagement.

Our study argues that satisfaction with various job aspects is important for employees to become energetic, dedicated and absorbed in their job. By taking this view we agree that (4a) job satisfaction and work engagement are distinct concepts, which is in-line with the existing literature (e.g. Schaufeli 2013) (2b) job satisfaction is an antecedent of work engagement. The discussion on whether job satisfaction is an antecedent or an outcome of work engagement is still debated. There is support for both views. Some studies argue that job satisfaction is an outcome (e.g. Saks, 2006; Avery, McKay and Wilson et al., 2007; Vecina, Chacon, Suerio and Barron, 2012) while other studies explain that job satisfaction is an antecedent of work engagement (e.g. Simpson 2009; Rayton and Yalabik 2014; Salanova, Llorens and Schaufeli 2011; Yalabik et al. 2013).

Our first reason to view job satisfaction as the antecedent of work engagement is about the satiation-activation differentiation.
Job satisfaction is an emotional evaluation of the job and is linked to the satiation state (Macey and Schneider, 2008) while work engagement is a motivational state and linked to activation (Macey and Schneider, 2008; Salanova et al., 2011). This means that once employees have evaluated their job, they are ready (or not, if they are not satisfied) to move into a motivational state i.e. become engaged. Next, drawing on from the JD-R model and Social Exchange Theory, the receipt of job resources isare positively related to job satisfaction which will create more engaged employees—Seers et al. (1995) suggest that the reciprocity-based relationship between the organisation and its employees predict positive work attitudes in the veil of job satisfaction. Therefore, when employees are offered job resources, they are satisfied with various facets of their job, and they may then provide the organisation with increased levels of work engagement.

Moreover, considering that work engagement is emerged from the burnout concept as its antipode (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008), we consider follow the link between job satisfaction and work engagement to decide the same directionality between job satisfaction and burnout. as it is well-established that job satisfaction is an antecedent of burnout (Lee and Ashforth, 1996); thus, job satisfaction should be also more likely to be the antecedent of work engagement as well. Recent studies support that job satisfaction and work engagement are distinct constructs, and job satisfaction is an antecedent of work engagement (Salanova et al., 2011; Simpson, 2009; Yalabik et al., 2013; Rayton and Yalabik, 2014).

SET helps us to explain the relationship between facets of job satisfaction, and work engagement by the norm of reciprocity (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). The social exchange signifies the expectation that when one person does a favor, this favor will be returned in the future (Aryee et al., 2002). Drawing from Blau (1964), the organisation in order to initiate the exchange has to provide resources that are
valuable to the employees (Molm et al., 2003; Cole et al., 2002). These resources provided by
the organisation entail an obligation on the part of the employees to reciprocate
with more positive personal attitudes and positive behaviors to the organisation (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005; Aryee et al., 2002; Eisenberger et al., 2001; McNeely and
Meglino, 1994; Haas and Deseran, 1981; Etzioni, 1961). The organisation may
initiate exchange by offering resources to the employees who enjoy higher levels of
satisfaction with various job facets and will reciprocate with higher levels of work
engagement. Alternatively, employees may initiate exchange by perceiving these resources
valuable and they are satisfied with facets of their job. Put differently, As employee
expectations about job conditions and rewards are satisfied by their organization, the
organizations, in return, receive positive attitudinal and behavioral outcomes reciprocity
which creates an exchange relationship between employees and organizations (Settoon et al.,
1996). Thus, we argue that when the employees are satisfied with various aspects of their job,
they are more likely to reciprocate by becoming more engaged in their job.

Vigor refers to energy, mental resilience, determination, and investing consistent effort in
your job. Dedication is about being inspired, identified with, enthusiastic and highly involved
in your job. The last dimension, absorption, refers to a sense of detachment from your
surroundings, a high degree of concentration on and immersion in your job, and a general lack
of conscious awareness of the amount of time spent on the job. An engaged employee, thus,
is one who is energetic, enthusiastic, and absorbed in his/her job.

It has “major implications as it is multidisciplinary and everlasting construct covering all
professions, work, jobs and contexts” (Spagnoli et al., 2012: 609).

2.2. Facets of Job Satisfaction
Social Exchange Theory is the theoretical framework adopted to explain the relationship between facets of job satisfaction, and work engagement in our study. The key principle of Social Exchange Theory is the norm of reciprocity (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). The social exchange signifies the expectation that when one person does a favor, this favor will be returned in the future (Aryee et al., 2002). Drawing on Blau (1964), the organization in order to initiate the exchange has to provide resources that are valuable to the employees (Molm et al., 2003; Cole et al., 2002). These resources provided by the organization entail an obligation on the part of the employees to reciprocate with more positive personal attitudes and positive behaviors to the organization (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005; Aryee et al., 2002; Eisenberger et al., 2001; McNeeley and Meglino, 1994; Haas and Deseran, 1981; Etzioni, 1961). The organization may initiate exchange by offering resources to the employees who enjoy higher levels of satisfaction with various job facets and will reciprocate with higher levels of work engagement. Alternatively, employees may initiate exchange by perceiving these resources valuable and they are satisfied with facets of their job. Put differently, as employee expectations about job conditions and rewards are satisfied by their organization, the organizations, in return, receive positive attitudinal and behavioral outcomes reciprocity which creates an exchange relationship between employees and organizations (Settoon et al., 1996). Thus, we argue that when the employees are satisfied with various aspects of their job, they are more likely to reciprocate by becoming more engaged in their job.

One stream of researchers focus on a global job satisfaction measure while the others argue that different aspects of a job might create satisfaction or dissatisfaction for employees (Weiss, 2002; Bowling, Hendricks and Wagner et al., 2008). It is supported that overall job satisfaction is the result of employees’ satisfaction with different aspects of their job (Skalli et al., 2008; Spagnoli et al., 2012). It is also shown that each facet significantly contributes to overall job satisfaction of employees (Skalli et al., 2008; Spagnoli et al., 2012).
Job satisfaction is stable overtime and facets are important indicators of overall job satisfaction (Spagnoli et al., 2012).

The facets of job satisfaction have been grouped in a variety of ways by previous authors. Locke (1976) suggests grouping of job satisfaction facets into: rewards, other people, nature of work and organizational context. Spector (1997) follows a similar categorization. In this study, we adopt the eleven job satisfaction facets of job satisfaction proposed by Spector (1997) as: job autonomy, satisfaction with nature of work itself, satisfaction with workload, operating conditions, pay, satisfaction, benefits, satisfaction, rewards, promotion rewards, recognition, performance recognition, promotion satisfaction, satisfaction with line managers, supervisor, satisfaction with co-workers and communication satisfaction. Spector (1997)’s categorization of job satisfaction facets and his scale is one of the most reliable scales in the literature (Spagnoli et al., 2012). Table 1 presents the facets of job satisfaction used in our study, which is consistent with Spector (1997)’s categorization.

The first job satisfaction grouping facet is the nature of work. Nature of work dimension includes three facets: ‘satisfaction with work itself’, ‘job autonomy’, and ‘satisfaction with workload’—Previous research indicates that the characteristics of a job impact an employee’s affective state, which in return impacts behavior towards the job. Employees who find their jobs more psychologically meaningful are found to be more engaged (Kahn, 1990; May et al., 2004). Earlier engagement studies that focus on the JD-R model argue that favorable job characteristics will lead to higher employee engagement (Saks, 2006; Schaufeli et al., 2008). Alternatively, as discussed, satisfaction with work is measured in the form of overall job satisfaction, which is positively linked to employee engagement (Saks, 2006; Alarcon and
Similarly, we argue that:

**Hypothesis 1:** Satisfaction with the nature of work will be positively related to work engagement.

Next dimension, job autonomy, is about the level of freedom the employees have in their job in areas such as decision-making, scheduling etc. (Hackman and Oldham, 1976). Job autonomy has been linked to work engagement in many studies as this is seen as one of the key job resources in JD-R model (Crawford et al., 2010; Fairlie, 2011; Tims et al., 2013). However, job autonomy as a job satisfaction facet has not been linked to engagement.

The third dimension, satisfaction with workload operating conditions, has not been analyzed in previous engagement studies. However, workload, or work overload, is seen as a challenge stressor (Podsakoff et al., 2007; van den Broeck et al., 2010). Work overload is positively related to burnout’s exhaustion dimension, which is conceptualized as the opposite of the dedication dimension (Maslach and Leiter, 2008). Workload is also shown to be negatively linked to work engagement as a job demand rather than a job resource (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Bakker and Demerouti, 2008; Crawford et al., 2010; Cole et al., 2012; Tims et al., 2013). Workload or work overload occurs when job demands exceed individual capabilities, hence, it is seen as a challenge stressor (Podsakoff et al., 2007; van den Broeck et al., 2010). Work overload is positively related to burnout’s exhaustion dimension, which is conceptualized as the opposite of the dedication dimension (Maslach and Leiter, 2008). It is argued that not all demands are negative and employees with reasonable job demands are found to be more energetic in their jobs (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). Thus, we expect that employees who are satisfied with their workload should have higher work engagement.
Hypothesis 1: Satisfaction with the nature of work will be positively related to work engagement.

Hypotheses 2: Satisfaction with operating conditions will be positively related to work engagement.

Our second set of hypotheses relates to the rewards dimension of job satisfaction facets: pay satisfaction, benefits satisfaction, promotion satisfaction, performance recognition and rewards recognitionsatisfaction. To our knowledge, only a recent study by HulkkoxNyman et al. (2012) specifically focuses on the relationship between work engagement and a comprehensive view of pay, benefits, promotion and rewards. HulkkoxNyman et al. (2012) find that non-monetary rewards, more specifically precisely appreciation of work, are significant positive predictors of vigor, dedication and absorption. Furthermore, their study finds that compared to other dimensions, benefits is the main one that is strongly related to the dedication of employees.

Traditionally, pay or compensation in one’s job has been considered as the most important aspect of an employee’s satisfaction (Deckop, 1992). However, the pay level is not a strong predictor of job satisfaction (Spector, 1997), though it does impact other work attitudes such as organizational commitment and intention to stay (Chew and Chan, 2008), and pay satisfaction (Heneman et al., 1997). Moreover, Herzberg et al., (2011) suggest that job satisfaction is determined by “motivators” such as job content, recognition, achievement, responsibilities, advancement and opportunities; whereas, job dissatisfaction is influenced by “hygiene factors” such as salary and working conditions, which also shows a weak relationship between pay and job satisfaction.

To our knowledge, only a recent study by HulkkoxNyman et al. (2012) specifically focuses on the relationship between work engagement and a comprehensive view of ‘rewards’. Their
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study finds that non-monetary rewards, more specifically appreciation of work, are significant positive predictors of vigor, dedication and absorption. Furthermore, they find that compared to other rewards dimensions, benefits is the main one that is strongly related to the dedication of employees.

Other studies focus on only one dimension of rewards dimension as job resources, mostly rewards and recognition, which are treated as overall reflections of job related rewards. Bakker et al. (2006) find that financial rewards are negatively related to perceptions of work engagement, although satisfaction with fringe benefits is positively related to work engagement. On the other hand, Gorter et al. (2008) show that financial rewards are positively related to work engagement. In addition, Fairlie (2011) does not find any link between extrinsic rewards, which is measured as combinations of fair pay, perks and other rewards for one’s efforts, and work engagement. A meta-analysis study by Crawford et al. (2010)'s suggests that the relationship between rewards and engagement can be either positive or negative since extrinsic rewards, such as pay, and salary may damage intrinsic motivation. Therefore, while rewards are important job resources that contribute to employee work engagement, further research is needed to understand their impact on engagement (Crawford et al., 2013).

Only a few studies consider promotion aspect as part of job resources characteristics and work engagement relationship. de Lange et al. (2008) examine the difference between employees who stayed in their job, promoted or left rather than focusing on promotion perceptions of employees. They find that there is a positive relationship between job resources and work engagement of the employees who have been recently promoted. Moreover, Balducci et al. (2011) emphasize that promotion prospects (combined with job autonomy and social aspects) is positively related to work engagement as part of job resources in addition to job autonomy and social aspects. As expected, their study finds a positive
relationship between job resources and work engagement; however, the individual impact of promotion prospects on work engagement is not specified. Recent changes to the employment relationship may mean that employees are more interested in career advancements in their job (Sullivan and Baruch, 2009), thus, increasing the importance of satisfaction with promotion opportunities.

Lastly, work engagement has been linked to employees’ job/task performance; and it has been found that engaged employees are high performers. (Rich et al., 2010; Christian et al., 2011). The performance implications of employee engagement are one of the reasons that make this concept popular among both practitioners and academics. The performance recognition facet will help us to understand whether the perceptions of performance management practices impact engagement of employees. This or a similar relationship has not been previously explored in the literature.

Improved rewards and/or recognition dimension of rewards have been linked to work engagement (Demerouti et al., 2001; Koyuncu et al., 2006; Maslach and Leiter, 2008; Crawford et al., 2010). All these previous studies view rewards and recognition as part of job resources—which positively contribute to work engagement of employees. Drawing from Social Exchange Theory, when employees are satisfied with the rewards offered by their organisation, they are expected to reciprocate with positive attitudes such as work engagement. The common additional job resources considered along with rewards and recognition are job autonomy and social support. In our study, rewards and recognition is considered in a different group of job resources, which could be seen as rewards as well such as pay and promotion. While we do not expect pay satisfaction to be the most important predictor of employee engagement, we expect that the rewards dimension of job satisfaction will matter. Therefore, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 23: Satisfaction with rewards-pay will be positively related to work
Hypothesis 4: Satisfaction with benefits will be positively related to work engagement.

Hypothesis 5: Satisfaction with promotion will be positively related to work engagement.

Hypothesis 6: Satisfaction with rewards will be positively related to work engagement.

Our third set of hypotheses captures other people dimension of job satisfaction facets. Satisfaction with line-managers and co-workers are under this dimension. In the work engagement literature, satisfaction with co-workers and supervisor/line-manager line-managers and co-workers are categorized as ‘social support’ under the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model. Social support is one of the mostly researched job resources in JD-R model (Bakker et al., 2004; Saks, 2006; de Lange et al., 2008; Fairlie, 2011; van den Broeck et al., 2011; Cole et al., 2012; van Beek et al., 2012; Mastenbroek et al., 2014), and it is measured in a variety of ways across studies. One group of studies uses a specific social support scale that includes both coworker and supervisor/line-manager support (Bakker et al., 2004; de Lange et al., 2008). Other set of studies differentiate between coworker and supervisor/line-manager supervisor support (Saks 2006; Fairlie 2011; van den Broeck et al., 2011; Cole et al., 2012; van Beek et al., 2012; Mastenbroek et al., 2014).

Social aspects of the work environment, for example, having friendly and supportive colleagues, has a significant impact on employee job perceptions (Chalofsky, 2003). Co-workers and supervisor/line-manager supervisors play important roles in various types of information acquisition, etc., and employees may become detached from their jobs if supervisor/line-manager supervisors are not perceived to be available and responsive (Lapalme et al., 2009). Thus, social support from co-workers and supervisor/line-manager
supervisors has been linked to increased work engagement (Demerouti et al., 2001; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Bakker et al., 2007; Bakker and Demerouti, 2007; Freeney and Fellenz, 2013).

**Social Exchange Theory** helps us to explain why “support” is reciprocated by increased positive attitudes such as engagement. Reciprocity not only ensures repaying, rather it creates a stronger and more solid relationship between the employee and the organisation (Walumbwa et al., 2009 Rousseau, 1995). In that sense, individuals seek to reciprocate so as to enhance the receipt of future resources and, hence, maintain the exchange relationship. Therefore, the exchanged resources signal the appearance of mutual support and maintenance of long-term relationships among the organizational members (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005; Aryee et al., 2002). According to Social Exchange Theory, employees reciprocate the care/support their organizations show with more effort and positive attitudes (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). Thus, we hypothesize that employees who are satisfied in their interactions with their co-workers and supervisors/line-managers will be more engaged with their work.

The type of support employees receive in their workplace is not limited to supervisor and co-worker support. An important dimension of support related constructs, i.e., perceived organizational support (POS), is not among the job satisfaction facets. POS captures employees’ general beliefs about how much their organizations value them, take care of them and pay attention to their well-being (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). We have included POS in our theoretical model. Our main reason is that POS involves perceived investments in employees and care given by their organizations (Lee and Bruvold, 2003). In other words, POS indicates the quality of social exchange relationships in an organization (Guerrero and Herrbach, 2009).

As explained, the previous studies have shown that social support, as a job resource, is a
strong predictor of work engagement, however, POS has not been included as part of social support. There are a few studies that explored the link between POS and employee engagement, in which POS is found to be a significant positive predictor of engagement (Saks, 2006; Alfes et al., 2013). Likewise, the number of studies that specifically focus on POS-work engagement is limited in number (Fairlie, 2011).

Our study is the first one that will provide a full test of employees’ support perception by focusing on three important sources i.e. line-managers, co-workers and organization. Employees might perceive approval, recognition, financial gains, and further information acquisition as indications of organizational support (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002), and employees who perceive support are more likely to reciprocate with positive attitudes like engagement. However, there is still not much evidence establishing the relationships between especially POS and the vigor, dedication and absorption dimensions of work engagement. The definition of job engagement used by Saks (2006) principally reflects the absorption dimension of work engagement, and leaves open the possibility that the relationships identified are limited by the omission of important dimensions of engagement.

Hypothesis 3: Satisfaction with other people (i.e. coworkers and line-managers) will be positively related to work engagement.

Hypothesis 8: Satisfaction with line-managers will be positively related to work engagement.

Hypothesis 4: Perceived organizational support will be positively related to work engagement.

Our last hypothesis relates to communication satisfaction facet of organizational context dimension. Communication contributes to the development of employee trust in organizations (Thomas et al., 2009). Communication satisfaction is an important contributory factor in the interaction between employees and their job environment, and it is linked with positive
employee attitudes such as organizational identification (Postmes et al., 2001). While the importance of communication has been linked to engagement in practitioner based sources (MacLeod and Clarke, 2009), the academic research has been slow to show such relationship.

May et al. (2004) explain the importance of open communication as a factor that contributes to supervisor support and impacts perceptions of supervisors. Similarly, Fairlie (2011) includes communication as part of leadership and organizational features as well as organizational support, however, there is not a direct linkage shown between communication and work engagement. —Iyer and Israel (2012)’s study has an extensive focus on communication satisfaction and engagement, which is defined and measured as the combination of commitment, satisfaction and withdrawal cognition of employees. They find that communication satisfaction has a positive significant impact on employee engagement. Furthermore, Vogelgesang et al. (2013) show that communication transparency, as part of the perceptions of leader behavioral integrity, and followers’ work engagements have been positively related. Lastly, Rees et al. (2013) find a direct relationship between perceptions of voice behavior and job engagement. While there are a few studies in the current literature on communication and engagement, no specific study focused on communication satisfaction and work engagement. Depending on SET, Again drawing on Social Exchange Theory, we expect that employees who have high communication satisfaction are more likely to be engaged in their work.

Hypothesis 59: Satisfaction with Communication satisfaction will be positively related to work engagement.

3. Methodology

Our data comes from employees in the specialist lending division of a UK bank. In this division, the employees provide a service. This division focuses on the provision of
non-standard mortgage products including mortgages for buy-to-rent properties as well as self-employed applicants who self-certify their income (e.g., the self-employed). These employees are not in direct contact with customers, but are involved in the processing and approval of applications generated through the retail branch network of the bank rather than directly dealing with customers. We collected our data. Data were collected via paper-based questionnaires in August 2009 and repeated the survey in August 2010. All 520 employees in the specialist lending division received our questionnaire. In 2009, 377 surveys were returned (73%). As a result of the second data collection, we had 202 repeat respondents. However, due to the missing data, the final dataset decreases to 175 in the regression analyses (33.4% final response rate). While the sample available for analysis is contingent on missing data, missing values analyses revealed no patterns to the missing observations.

To be able to answer our survey, the employees were given time-off during their work. We asked respondents their employee numbers to be able to match the surveys across time. To be able to protect the confidentiality of the respondents, pre-paid envelopes were provided so that the respondents would be able to return the completed survey directly to the authors. Employees took time off during their work day to respond our survey. In the survey, the respondents were asked to provide their employee numbers for two reasons. The first one was due to the longitudinal design of our study. In addition, the three randomly selected respondents were identified and the second reason was to be able to provide monetary incentives to the three randomly selected respondents. As supported by Newby et al. (2003), monetary incentives are used by various researchers and it is shown that they positively contribute to increase in survey response rate and quality data without introducing bias (Newby et al., 2003). To achieve these aims,

we provided a pre-paid envelope with the questionnaire so that they could return their
filled survey directly to the authors. This step was essential to ensure confidentiality of their responses and helped us to receive a high return to our survey.

3.1 Measures

This section explains our dependent, independent and control variables. Unless otherwise indicated, dependent and independent variables are measured by using a 7-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree). All constructs pass confirmatory factor-analytic tests for unidimensionality. **All hypotheses are tested via** Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression analyses. **In the regression analyses**, all job satisfaction facets related scales (**i.e. JSS**) measures are measured in **Time 1** (**i.e. August 2009**) dataset while the work engagement measure comes from the second-wave of our data i.e. **Time 2** (**August 2010**) dataset.

3.1.1. Dependent Variable: Work Engagement

Work engagement is measured by the seventeen-item version of Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) (Schaufeli et al., 2006). The work engagement is measured during Time 2.

Vigor is measured by six items (**α**= 0.84). A sample item is, “When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.” Dedication is measured by five items (**α**= 0.92). A sample item is, “I am enthusiastic about my job.” The third work engagement dimension, absorption, is measured by six items (**α**= 0.87). A sample item is, “When I am working, I forget everything else around me.”

3.1.2 Independent variables

3.1.2a Facets of Job Satisfaction

The details of each facet are explained below. Unless specified otherwise, the scales are developed by To measure facets of job satisfaction, we have used Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) developed by Spector (1997) (**please see Table 1 for items**). The items are listed in
Table 1: All independent variables (i.e. job satisfaction facets) are measured during Time 1.

Table 1 here.

Descriptive statistics and collinearity diagnostics from our regression analyses are presented in Table 2. Correlations and reliability statistics for our dependent and independent variables are provided in Table 3. All independent variables (i.e. job satisfaction facets) are measured during Time 1. For operating conditions facet, we had to drop one of the items i.e. “My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape” due to low reliability score. In addition, although Spector (1997) originally implemented the supervision facet with the term “supervisor”, our investigation of the organizational structure of the company we collected our data from indicated that the term “line manager” was used. In order to avoid confusing respondents, we replaced the term supervisor with line manager in our survey questions. Since there were many different departments in this organization, there were enough line managers to generate variance. Thus, we replaced the term supervisor with line manager.

Descriptive statistics, correlations and reliability statistics for both dependent and independent variables are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 here.

Table 3 here.

- Satisfaction with work itself Nature of work is measured by four items ($\alpha=0.88$). A sample item is, “I like doing the things I do at work.”
- Satisfaction with workload Operating conditions is measured by four items ($\alpha=0.81$)
however, one of the items did not load. A sample item is, “The workload in my job is too heavy.”

- **Job Autonomy** is measured using a three-item scale from Edwards (2009) (α=0.90). A sample item is, “I have the opportunity to decide how and what I do in my job.”

- **Pay Satisfaction** is measured by five items (α=0.84). A sample item is, “Compared with wages paid for similar jobs outside my organization, I feel satisfied with my wage.”

- **Benefits Satisfaction** is measured by five items (α=0.84). A sample item is, “The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.”

- **Rewards Recognition** is measured by four items (α=0.85). A sample item is, “When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.”

- **Performance Recognition** is measured with a four-item scale from Yu and Egri (2005) (α=0.75). A sample item is, “I understand very well how my performance is measured.”

- **Promotion Satisfaction** is measured by four items (α=0.84). A sample item is, “I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.”

- **Satisfaction with line manager** is measured by four items (α=0.87). Spector originally implemented this scale as satisfaction with “supervisor”, but investigation of the organizational structure of the company indicated that the term “line manager” was appropriate in order to avoid confusing respondents. Since there are many different departments in this organization, there are enough line managers to generate variance. A sample item is, “My line manager shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.”

- **Satisfaction with co-workers** is measured by four items (α=0.67). A sample item is, “I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work
Communication Satisfaction is measured by four items ($\alpha = 0.78$). A sample item is, “I often feel that I do not know what is going on within my organization.”

Perceived Organizational Support is measured by the eight-item scale of Rhoades et al. (2001) ($\alpha = 0.92$). The sample items are, “My organization shows little concern for me” and “Help is available from my organization when I have a problem.”

3.1 Control Variables

With the permission of respondents, we provided a list of employee numbers to the company in order to obtain detailed demographic information. The company was not provided any survey responses for obvious ethical reasons. We used this data to construct age, gender, tenure, and job level controls, all of which have been found to be important contextual factors in the measurement of employee attitudes. Age and tenure are continuous variables based on birthdates and dates of initial employment with the company. Gender is a dummy variable which equals one for women and zero for men.

Job level captures the position of the employee in the company hierarchy. There are three job levels among respondents: non-managerial, front line managers and senior managers, each corresponding to a salary band. We excluded all nine responses from senior managers in the interests of comparability, though our results are unaffected by this choice. The front line managers represent the first tier of management above the entry level, and we have retained them in the sample because the majority of their day-to-day tasks are the same as those of the people they lead. As a result, we include a job level dummy variable equaling one for the 70% of our sample who are non-managerial employees.

4. Analyses and Results

Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression is the method used to run our analyses via
We conducted separate regression analyses on our three dependent variables (i.e. vigour, dedication and absorption) in order to evaluate their relationships with each job satisfaction facets and POS. The results are presented in Table 43.

The first hypothesis stated that satisfaction with the ‘Nature of Work’ would be positively related to work engagement. We see that ‘satisfaction with work itself’ is a positive predictor of vigor ($\beta=0.357381570$, $p<0.01$), dedication ($\beta=0.334332548$, $p<0.01$) and absorption ($\beta=0.2570483$, $p<0.01$). Conversely, job autonomy has no significant relationship with the dependent variables.

These results provide full support for hypothesis 1. The hypothesis 2 is about the satisfaction with operating conditions. The way satisfaction with operating conditions is measured means that higher scores mean low satisfaction with operating conditions. In other words, higher scores mean high workload. Our results show that there is evidence that ‘Satisfaction with workload’ is inversely related to absorption ($\beta=-0.472186232$, $p<0.051$). We conclude that hypothesis 2 is partially supported as there is no relationship of satisfaction with operating conditions with vigour and dedication.

For the rest of our hypotheses we find no support. For hypothesis 3, there is no support for the link between pay satisfaction and vigour ($\beta=0.02015$, $p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta=0.27059$, $p<0.00$), and absorption ($\beta=0.04945$, $p<0.00$). Hypothesis 4 is not supported, and our analyses show that there is no significant relationship between benefits satisfaction and vigour ($\beta=-0.0102$, $p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta=-0.0012$, $p<0.00$), and absorption ($\beta=0.0047$, $p<0.00$). Hypothesis 5, which is about promotion-work engagement link, is not supported. There is no link between promotion and vigour ($\beta=-0.404026$, $p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta=-
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Similarly, there is no support for the relationship between rewards and vigour ($\beta=-0.06$, $p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta=0.074101$, $p<0.00$), and absorption ($\beta=0.07445$, $p<0.00$) i.e. no support for hypothesis 6.

Hypothesis 2 expects a direct relationship between satisfaction with rewards and work engagement. Inspection of the point estimates associated with each of the variables within the block of rewards variables suggests support only for a link between ‘satisfaction with promotion opportunities’ and dedication ($\beta=0.162$, $p<0.05$). We did not find any statistically significant relationships between work engagement and satisfaction with co-workers (i.e. hypotheses 7) and vigour ($\beta=0.053$, $p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta=0.015$, $p<0.00$), and absorption ($\beta=0.010$, $p<0.00$). There is no support for the relationship between satisfaction with line-managers (i.e. hypotheses 8) and vigour ($\beta=-0.037$, $p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta=-0.069$, $p<0.00$) and absorption ($\beta=-0.123$, $p<0.00$). The final hypothesis, i.e. satisfaction with and communication (hypothesis 9), is partially supported. Our results show no link between satisfaction with communication co-workers and vigour ($\beta=0.046$, $p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta=0.0542$, $p<0.00$), and absorption ($\beta=0.04182$, $p<0.00$); satisfaction with line-managers and vigour ($\beta=0.002$, $p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta=0.003$, $p<0.00$), and absorption ($\beta=0.039$, $p<0.00$); and satisfaction with communication and vigour ($\beta=0.097$, $p<0.00$), dedication ($\beta=0.079$, $p<0.00$), and absorption ($\beta=0.103$, $p<0.00$). Our finding means that the employees who are satisfied with the communication in their job are more absorbed in their work.

Considering that nine job satisfaction facets are correlated that pay satisfaction, benefits satisfaction, rewards recognition or performance recognition. This suggests very limited support for Hypothesis 2. We see no evidence in support of Hypothesis 3. with each other, we also tested for multi-collinearity in our regression analyses. The tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) scores, which are indicators of multi-collinearity, are calculated in SPPS and presented in Table 4. It is accepted that tolerance scores that are under 0.10 (e.g.,
Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001) and VIF scores over 10 are problematic (Neter, Wasserman, & Kutner, 1989). The multi-collinearity scores of tolerance and VIF in Table 4 do not fall in the undesired levels. Thus, we conclude that multi-collinearity is not a problem in our regression analyses.

---

Hypothesis 4 stated that the POS would be directly related to work engagement, and the regression coefficients confirm this result for all three dependent variables: vigor (β=0.362, p<0.01), dedication (β=0.204, p<0.01) and absorption (β=0.344, p<0.01). We see no evidence in support of Hypothesis 5.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of our study is to understand the impact of job satisfaction facets on work engagement. Our results show that ‘satisfaction with work itself’ and ‘perceived organizational support’ are key drivers of all dimensions of work engagement i.e. vigor, dedication and absorption. In addition, ‘satisfaction with promotion opportunities’ operating conditions’ positively (i.e. high workload) is negatively related to dedication absorption of employees in their work. Finally, our results show that while ‘satisfaction with workload’ communication has negatively impact on the absorption of employees in their work.

Our study contributes to our understanding about the drivers of work engagement. The key
concepts were drawn from work engagement and well-established job satisfaction literatures to explore the relationship between the job satisfaction perceptions of employees and their work engagement. While the JD-R model has been frequently tested in the literature, none of the previous studies provided a systematic and complete reflection of job characteristics and discussed their impact on work engagement. Thus, by drawing on the well-established job satisfaction concept and its facets, we expand the JD-R model and observe the impact job satisfaction facets have on the work engagement of service employees. Barnes and Collier (2013) find that job satisfaction has significant impact on work engagement compared to service environment and affective commitment. Considering the challenges faced by employees in the service sector, work engagement is harder to achieve and worth exploring in the service context (Menguc et al., 2012). Thus, our study also contributes to the limited number of studies that focus on work engagement of service sector employees in UK. Lastly, the longitudinal dimension of our study helps us to understand the impact of which job satisfaction facets on work engagement continue in the long-run, and helps us to avoid common method bias in our results.

The first part of our results indicate that work engagement is more likely to occur when employees feel supported by their organizations as well as when they are satisfied with the work, they are more likely to become engaged. This finding supports a social exchange perspective and specifically the norm of reciprocity. In other words, employees who are supported by their organization and satisfied with their work will display more vigor, dedication and absorption. Our findings suggest that organizations that care about employee well-being; consider employee goals, values and opinions; and help employees with the problems they face will have employees who are energetic, enthusiastic and captivated in their jobs, and who are engaged with the whole organization.

Satisfaction with work itself is a main facet employees use to evaluate their job (Skalli et
Our finding is in-line with the previous research as satisfaction with work facet is positively linked to vigor, dedication, and absorption of employees. Finding meaning in work comes from the interaction between the internal world of employees and the external context of the workplace (Cartwright and Holmes, 2006; Chalofsky and Krishna, 2009), but the work itself is argued to be the strongest predictor of meaning in the workplace and the main motivator for employees (Chalofsky, 2003). Work is a source of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, both of which are about exerting effort, persistence and energy towards a specific goal (Katzell and Thompson, 1990). In work, the task content, the activities performed and the fulfilment of personal needs drives employees. Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation are closely related to the vigor and dedication dimensions of work engagement (Bakker et al., 2008). Our results support these previous studies.

Following the same discussion, our study shows that the employees who perceived their workload as high (i.e. satisfaction with operating conditions), are less likely to be absorbed in their work. That is also in line with the previous literature. However, the previous studies that consider the workload as a job demand mostly focus on the overall work engagement. Our study shows that satisfaction with promotion opportunities is positively related to dedication. Employees who perceive good opportunities for advancement feel more dedicated. This result is consistent with literature discussing how changing job perceptions have led to the increasing importance of factors like career advancement relative to more traditional work aspects such as compensation (Chalofsky, 2003; Cartwright and Holmes, 2006), but interestingly the effects identified in this research are limited to the dedication of employees. This illustrates the value of our approach to examining the impacts of the facets of job satisfaction on the three domains of work engagement. Its relationship is only with the absorption dimension. This finding implies that absorption and
how it is impacted by workload should be considered in more detail. It might be that having high workload might act as a distraction for the employees and decrease their absorption in their work due to the worry and/or stress it creates.

Finally, our study shows that satisfaction with communication is positively linked to absorption of the employees in their work. As discussed in the literature section, satisfaction with communication has been the focus of only a few previous studies in terms of its relationship to employee engagement, not specifically work engagement. Alternatively, the way communication defined is different from what we find in our study. Therefore, to our knowledge, our study is the first study that considers the link between satisfaction with communication facet and work engagement. We find that satisfaction with communication is positively linked to the absorption of employees in their work. This means that clarity with what is going on in the organization helps employees to be immersed in their work.

Our results did not find any support about the link between satisfaction with pay and work engagement, which is in line with the previous literature. We can conclude that pay satisfaction is a hygiene factor as discussed in the literature (e.g. Herzberg et al., 2011). Similarly, satisfaction with benefits is not found to be linked to work engagement. As benefits satisfaction has not been explored much in the work engagement literature, there is need for more studies to understand how benefits satisfaction is linked to work engagement. The link between satisfaction with rewards and work engagement is an under-researched area as discussed. Our study does not show any linkages between rewards satisfaction and individual dimensions of work engagement. We also could not find any relationship between promotion satisfaction and work engagement dimensions. Considering the limited previous research in the area, our study might be a starting point but there is definitely need for further research as todays employees are very much interested in promotion opportunities (Sullivan and Baruch, 2009).
As explained, line manager support and coworker support are combined as ‘social support’ job resource in previous work engagement studies. There is no unified way of measuring or defining social support. In this study, we specifically focused on satisfaction with co-workers and satisfaction with line managers. It is surprising that our results do not show any support for the link between coworker or line-manager support and individual dimensions of work engagement. There is definitely need to unwrap the dynamics of coworker or line-manager support and work engagement in the future studies.

The results of our study have important implications for organizations. Understanding sources of satisfaction for service sector employees might help organizations about under which conditions to expect engagement from their employees. Engaged employees are more likely to stay with their organizations (Saks, 2006), and a disengaged workforce might lead to higher costs associated with higher turnover, lower productivity, eroded psychological well-being and poor physical health (Ruhlman and Siegman, 2009). Our findings suggest that the nature of work, organizational support, providing promotion opportunities and pay satisfaction are important aspects organizations should consider to manage these costs.

As with all studies, ours has limitations. Generalization of our results is difficult since the data are from a single UK company in the service sector, though we note that our results are consistent with those found by other researchers where comparisons are possible. Future studies might apply our theoretical model to other contexts. For example, job satisfaction facets and work engagement link might be tested to compare of service sector employees to employees in other industries. As the work conditions differ among sectors, the facets that shape employees’ engagement might differ across sectors. Such comparison is yet to be provided in the literature. Furthermore, Skalli et al., (2008) argue that differences in economic and cultural aspects across countries might shape the impact of job satisfaction facets on employee attitudes. Therefore, future studies might also focus on expanding our results to
different country contexts.

Notes:

1. The three prizes were for £250, £100 and £50 in cash, respectively.
2. β is the standardized regression coefficient.
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Table 1: Facets of Job Satisfaction and Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets of Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Scale Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>I sometimes feel my job is meaningless. (R)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like doing the things I do at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My job is enjoyable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Conditions</td>
<td>Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have too much to do at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have too much paperwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.</em> **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raises are too few and far between. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job. ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor is unfair to me. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like my supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The benefit package we have is equitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are benefits we do not have which we should have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are few rewards for those who work here. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the people I work with.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy my co-workers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much bickering and fighting at work. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications seem good within this organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals of this organization are not clear to me. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work assignments are not fully explained. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (R): reverse coded.
** This italicized item for ‘operating conditions’ facet is not included in our scale calculations and reliability analyses.
*** The term supervisor is replaced with ‘line manager’ in our survey.

Source: Spector (1997), Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS): [http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jssovr.html](http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jssovr.html)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Cronbach’s alpha measures are provided in parentheses on the main diagonal.
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics, Correlations and Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vigor</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.762**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.742**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.744**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with work</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.576**</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with operating conditions</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.235**</td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td>.169**</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with benefits</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.226**</td>
<td>.243**</td>
<td>.154**</td>
<td>.364***</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.515**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with rewards</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.307**</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td>.549**</td>
<td>.348**</td>
<td>.553**</td>
<td>.461**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with promotion</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.269**</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.216**</td>
<td>.425**</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>.315**</td>
<td>.548**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with coworkers</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.181*</td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.222**</td>
<td>.308*</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>.421**</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with line manager</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.174*</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.344**</td>
<td>.220**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.498**</td>
<td>.318**</td>
<td>.461**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with communication</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.378**</td>
<td>.315**</td>
<td>.333**</td>
<td>.475**</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.348**</td>
<td>.299**</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td>.416**</td>
<td>.420**</td>
<td>.324**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>34.02</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.164**</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.157**</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.165*</td>
<td>.188**</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.110*</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.109*</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (in years)</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.203**</td>
<td>.108*</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.150**</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.531**</td>
<td>-.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managerial worker</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.256**</td>
<td>-.197**</td>
<td>-.200**</td>
<td>-.287**</td>
<td>.148**</td>
<td>-.349**</td>
<td>-.246**</td>
<td>-.177**</td>
<td>-.192**</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.214**</td>
<td>-.283**</td>
<td>.179**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Cronbach’s alpha measures are provided in parentheses on the main diagonal.
Table 3: Multiple Regression Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vigor</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>Absorption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.025*</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.161*</td>
<td>.178*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (in years)</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managerial worker</td>
<td>-.085**</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facets of Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with work</td>
<td>.570**</td>
<td>.548**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with operating conditions</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.232**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with benefits</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with rewards</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with promotion</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with co-workers</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with line-manager</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with communication</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.182*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-squared</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>6.944**</td>
<td>7.351**</td>
<td>5.940**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < 0.01,  * p < 0.05

The standardized regression coefficients are provided.
### Table 4. Multi-Collinearity Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vigor</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>Absorption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>VIF</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>1.656</td>
<td>0.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (in years)</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>1.735</td>
<td>0.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managerial worker</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>0.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facets of Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with work</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>0.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with operating conditions</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>2.004</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with benefits</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with rewards</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>2.412</td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with promotion</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with co-workers</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with line-manager</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>1.679</td>
<td>0.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with communication</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>1.883</td>
<td>0.541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Facets of Job Satisfaction **Categorization and Survey Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets of Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Scale Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Work itself</td>
<td>I sometimes feel my job is meaningless. (R)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Workload</td>
<td>I like doing the things I do at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy</td>
<td>I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Satisfaction</td>
<td>My job is enjoyable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Line Manager (or supervisor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Co-workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Conditions</td>
<td>Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have too much to do at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have too much paperwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape. **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raises are too few and far between. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job. ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor is unfair to me. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like my supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The benefit package we have is equitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are benefits we do not have which we should have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are few rewards for those who work here. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>I like the people I work with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoy my co-workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is too much bickering and fighting at work. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communications seem good within this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The goals of this organization are not clear to me. (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work assignments are not fully explained. (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (R): reverse coded.  
** This italicized item for ‘operating conditions’ facet is not included in our scale calculations and reliability analyses.  
*** The term supervisor is replaced with ‘line manager’ in our survey.  

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).  
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
Cronbach’s alpha measures are provided in parentheses on the main diagonal.  

Source: Spector (1997), Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS): http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jsovr.html
### Table 2: Descriptive statistics and collinearity diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vigor</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Absorption</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Employee age in years</td>
<td>33.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tenure in years</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Non-managerial worker</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Job autonomy</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Satisfaction with work</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Satisfaction with workload</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Satisfaction with benefits</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Satisfaction with performance recognition</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Satisfaction with rewards</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Satisfaction with promotion opportunities</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Satisfaction with communication</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Perceived organizational support</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Satisfaction with co-workers</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Satisfaction with line manager</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: Descriptive Statistics, Correlations and Reliability Statistics
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**

Cronbach's alpha measures are provided in parentheses on the main diagonal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfaction with pay</th>
<th>Satisfaction with benefits</th>
<th>Satisfaction with rewards</th>
<th>Satisfaction with promotion</th>
<th>Satisfaction with coworkers</th>
<th>Satisfaction with line manager</th>
<th>Satisfaction with communication</th>
<th>Age (in years)</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Tenure (in years)</th>
<th>Non-managerial worker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>34.02</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.235**</td>
<td>.226**</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>.269**</td>
<td>.181*</td>
<td>.168*</td>
<td>.378**</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.256**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td>.243**</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td>.174*</td>
<td>.315**</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.197**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.169*</td>
<td>.154**</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td>.216**</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.333**</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.200**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>.364**</td>
<td>.549**</td>
<td>.425**</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.344**</td>
<td>.475**</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.287**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.348**</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>.220**</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.164**</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.148**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.78)</td>
<td>(.78)</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td>(.67)</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td>(.78)</td>
<td>(.NA)</td>
<td>(.NA)</td>
<td>(.NA)</td>
<td>(.NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Multiple Regression Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vigor</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>Absorption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.025*</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.161*</td>
<td>.178*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (in years)</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managerial worker</td>
<td>-.085**</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facets of Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with work</td>
<td>.570**</td>
<td>.548**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with operating conditions</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.232**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with benefits</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with performance recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with rewards</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with promotion</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with co-workers</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with line-manager</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived organization support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with communication</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.182*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-squared</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>6.944**</td>
<td>7.351**</td>
<td>5.940**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05

The standardized regression coefficients are provided.
### Table 4. Multi-Collinearity Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control variables</th>
<th>Vigor Tolerance</th>
<th>Vigor VIF</th>
<th>Dedication Tolerance</th>
<th>Dedication VIF</th>
<th>Absorption Tolerance</th>
<th>Absorption VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>1.656</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>1.659</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>1.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>1.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (in years)</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>1.735</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>1.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managerial worker</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>1.713</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>1.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facets of Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with work</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>2.003</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with operating</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>1.499</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>1.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>2.004</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>1.973</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>2.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with benefits</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>1.524</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>1.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with rewards</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>2.412</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>2.404</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>2.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with promotion</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>1.584</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>1.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with co-workers</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>1.477</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>1.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with line-manager</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>1.679</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>1.678</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>1.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with communication</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>1.883</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>1.848</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>1.859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facets of Job Satisfaction and Work Engagement

Response to Reviewers’ Comments

Reviewer(s)’ Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Comments:
The idea of this paper suggested that there was a research gap for the literature, sound promising for publication. Personally, the topic is interesting. However, there were some major concerns in the literature, methodology, as well as result and implication. One of the major issues is Perceived organization support, which is a unique variable, but not one of the dimensions in one facet of job satisfaction. Also, POS was a well-known variable to have significant relationship with a lot of organizational behaviors. If treating it as job satisfaction, it is misleading.

Thank you for this comment. We now revised our model and analyses. The model discussed and tested in the revised manuscript only focuses on the Job Satisfaction Facets defined by Spector (1997). POS is not part of the revised model. The details and scale items for the job satisfaction facets are summarised in Table 1.

Another significant finding was satisfaction with work itself, which is mainly related to the general concept of overall job satisfaction. The authors claimed that they want to clarify the different facets of job satisfaction to predict work engagement. Although this study tried to use different facets of job satisfaction, the results of this study showed that only POS and work satisfaction predicts Work engagement significantly, i.e., it repeated the findings of previous. Thus, it did not show much contribution of the job satisfaction and work engagement both theoretically and practically.
Thank you for this comment. We agree that our findings support previous studies. However, the previous studies did not consider the well-established job satisfaction facets and their relationship to work engagement. In addition, our study considers the overtime relationship between the job satisfaction facets and work engagement. This has not been considered before in the literature. Finally, the focus of our study is on service employees, which is not considered extensively in the literature either. These contributions are emphasised in the introduction section of the revised manuscript Pages 2-3.

Besides, the results section was not clear, readers have to interpret the results based on the tables, which provided more information than the paragraphs.

Thank you for this comment. This is now corrected and more explanation of the results are provided in the analysis section. Pages 14-15-16.

Overall, it is a good attempt to select this topic, however, major concerns have to be further explained and clarified.

Thank you.

Additional Questions:

Do the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Due to the limited study of the relationships between the facets of job satisfaction, and work engagement, the idea of this paper suggested that there was a research gap for the literature, sound promising for publication.

Thank you.

Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: At the beginning, it is very good for the
author to mention the relationship between work engagement and job satisfaction, and suggested that are distinct variables.

Thank you.

However, there were some concerns for clarifying the literature of both work engagement and job satisfaction.

For job satisfaction, it was good to argue job satisfaction is a multi-facets variable, however, some important literature about viewing job satisfaction as a multi-facets variable was missing. For example, Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) identified five job satisfaction measures, i.e. with pay, promotion, coworkers, supervisors and the work itself. Twenty years later, Roznowski’s (1989) updated version of the Smith et al. (1969) job satisfaction. And this concept of job satisfaction has been adopted in various textbooks of organizational behavior for many years, e.g., see Robbins & Judge (2014).


Thank you for this comment. The suggested studies are now included in our discussion. We also included other studies regarding the multi-dimensional approach to job satisfaction. Specifically, the work of Smith et al., (1969), Boles et al. (2007) and Churchill et al. (1974) are presented in support of the multi-dimensional nature of job satisfaction (Page 2). Still, we decided to follow the categorization by Spector (1997) for two reasons. First of all, it is the latest categorisation compared to Roznowski (1989) and Smith et al. (1969). Second, our survey and data included the exact items of Spector (1997) created. The Job satisfaction book discussion by Spector already discusses and recognises both studies, which are not ignored in his categorisation of the scale items.

Interestingly, in this literature, it grounded heavily only on Spector (1997) job satisfaction, it also suggested job satisfaction as a multi-facets variable. However, some dimensions in its
facets, namely job autonomy, and perceived organizational support are unique variables, they have been used as distinct variables for various OB studies for many years. They should be unique one rather than as dimensions of facets of work engagement.

Thank you for this comment. As explained, the revised model only discusses and tests the job satisfaction facets scales/items suggested by Spector (1997). Thus job autonomy and POS are not part of the revised model anymore.

For Work engagement, authors suggested several significant work engagement studies, like the Utrecht groups (Schaufeli, et al., 2006), as mentioned by the authors, they treated work engagement as the antipode of burnout, while they also mentioned Kahn (1990); May et al. (2004); Saks (2006) and Crawford (2013), those studies used an approach which was different from the Utrecht groups, author should provide clearer idea of the work engagement literature.

Thank you for this comment. The discussion of employee engagement literature is now expanded. The terms employee engagement and work engagement are used interchangeably in the academic literature. However, work engagement is more narrow-focused and precise as it concerns the relationship between the employee and his or her work (Truss et al., 2013). This is now stated in the introduction section. In addition, we introduced different scales and conceptualisations of employee engagement on Pages 3-4.

In addition, for the hypothesis, for each facet of job satisfaction, there were several dimensions, but hypotheses were made based on each facet, there were confusions whether studying each dimension of the facets.

Thank you for this comment. This is now corrected as we changed our model. The revised hypotheses focus on each facet. There are no groupings of the facets.

3. Methodology: Is the paper’s argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: The
procedure of the methodology was fine, there was a concern of the great loss of the respondents from 520 to 169, which may evolve the confirmation bias for such kind of survey arrangement.

Thank you for this comment. We agree that the decrease from 520 to 175 is a great drop. Unfortunately, we cannot change this. Due to the loss of company contact (senior manager who moved to another organisation), we did not have the opportunity to go back and collect more data from the same organisation to be able to expand our sample size or longitudinal aspect of our dataset.

Besides, for a questionnaire study, 169 is relatively small numbers of respondents.

The new sample size is 175 in the regression analyses. This is due to dropping job autonomy, performance recognition and POS items. We agree that the sample size is low. However, we did/do not have additional data collection opportunity.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper? The results section was quite short, the authors mentioned that they run several regressions for three facets of work engagement, and provided the beta of the independent variables for each work engagement facets, however, no idea about what kind of regressions they used, and what is the total R-square, and the R-square change for all the predictors. In Table 4, it gave a clearer concept of the predictors of three facets of work engagement. Since they did not provide any R-square change for each predictor, based on the beta provided, it seemed that only satisfaction with work itself and perceived organizational support were the strongest predictors. So, they supported Hypothesis 1 and 4. However, as I mentioned earlier, perceived organizational support was a unique variable rather than a facet of job satisfaction. Therefore, even the hypothesis was supported, but it is about POS predict work engagement but not job satisfaction predict work engagement. Another strong predictor was satisfaction with work itself, which is mainly related to the general concept of overall job satisfaction. So, this result did not show much contribution of the job satisfaction and...
work engagement theories. Besides, no conclusion section was found, there were results and Discussion sections only.

Thank you for this comment. This is now corrected and more explanation of the results are provided in the analysis section (Pages 14-15). The type of regression analyses used is the Multiple Linear Regression (Ordinary Least Squares). This is now specified at Page 14. The R-square and Adjusted R-square are specified in Table 4. We did not include the R-square change in the paper but here they are for your information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Vigour</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Dedication</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Absorption</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: Age, Gender, Tenure, Job Level, Satisfaction with work, Satisfaction with operating conditions, Satisfaction with pay, Satisfaction with benefits, Satisfaction with rewards, Satisfaction with promotion, Satisfaction with co-workers, Satisfaction with line-manager, Satisfaction with communication.

<b>5. Practicality and/or Research implications:</b> Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper? Although there was not a section “Implications”, but based on the discussion, there were some explanations the authors provided for the findings, they confirmed that satisfaction with work itself and perceived organizational support were the strongest predictors, and they suggested the management should provide more support to the employees to increase work engagement. It is true, but POS is not job
satisfaction. Moreover, POS was found to be positively correlated to work engagement (Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010; Saks, 2006). That is, POS was proved to be strong predictor of work engagement, this finding matched to those previous studies. However, it did not provide a concrete contribution for the theory.

Thank you for this comment. As explained, POS is now dropped from the analyses. By focusing on the job satisfaction facets and Social Exchange Theory to link them to work engagement, we hope that we are contributing to the both job satisfaction and work engagement literatures.

<b>6. Quality of Communication:  </b> Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Page 19, line 30, should be pay satisfaction

Thank you, this is now corrected.

Overall, the paper (except the result section) is clearly express, and is easy to read. However, a lot of attention needed for the following issues:

- For literature, clearer explanation of the job satisfaction and work engagement, especially, some facets of job satisfaction in this study were found to be distinct variables in OB literature.
- Elaborate the results section
- Add conclusion section for explaining results

Thank you, we hope we answered all these questions and concerns as part of previous response as well as in the revised manuscript.
Reviewer: 2

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: NO

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Reasonable. The hypotheses are simple. There is a lack of more sophisticated theory, testing mediation or moderation. Although some theories are presented, i.e. social exchange. They are not part of the model. A missed opportunity.

Thank you. Following this comment and the comments by reviewer 3, we now deemphasized the Job-Demands Resources Model. Instead, the relationship between job satisfaction facets and work engagement is explained by Social Exchange Theory. This theoretical framework is emphasized in the introduction, literature review and discussion/conclusion sections.

We revised our hypotheses around each job satisfaction facet. We did not test any mediation or moderation as our aim is to understand which facets of job satisfaction are linked to work engagement.

3. Methodology: Is the paper’s argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: No. This is a very simple design. Basically testing whether job satisfaction is related to engagement. And, of course, it is. The year apart do not qualify as enough reason to judge this study much different from a cross-sectional study/ For this, the authors should have measured all concepts twice and tested a cross-lagged panel design.

We understand your points. The overall job satisfaction is linked to work engagement. However, there are no previous studies that explain the link between
facets of job satisfaction, which provide us more detailed information about one’s perceptions of his/her job, and work engagement. Showing that was our aim to start this paper rather than testing a mediation or moderation effect.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: No. Measuring two variables a year apart, does not make it a causal model

Thank you. We agree that our model is not a casual model. We carefully reread the paper to avoid such implication.

5. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Not really. The design is too simple.

We understand your point, thank you.

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Reasonable

Thank you. We reread the revised manuscript to avoid any issues in terms of communication.
Reviewer: 3

Comments:

Review:

Manuscript ID EBHRM-08-2015-0036, entitled “Facets of Job Satisfaction and Work Engagement: Expansion of Job Resources”

This paper examines different facets of job satisfaction and their relationship to three components of work engagement. Panel data from 169 UK employees shows only limited support for the hypotheses. An effort was made to provide over-time analyses by including two time points across one year. Despite these efforts, I have several concerns about the theory, the methods and analyses that I would like to share with the authors. I hope the authors will find my suggestions helpful and constructive.

Introduction:

1. It was unclear to me why it was mentioned that the study draws upon the JDR model. While this is a natural choice, the JDR model was not used to derive any of the predictions. It might be possible to de-emphasize the JDR in the introduction, or otherwise to use the JDR to make predictions.

   Thank you for this comment. Following your suggestion, we deemphasized the Job-Demands Resources Model. Instead, the relationship between job satisfaction facets and work engagement is explained by Social Exchange Theory. This theoretical framework is emphasized in the introduction, literature review and discussion/conclusion sections (Pages 2; 5; 9-10; 17)

2. Related to point 1, the SET was used mainly for deriving predictions, yet it is not mentioned in the introduction. Therefore, I would emphasize the SET in the introduction.

   Thank you. We now frame our model drawing from SET starting from the introduction section (Page 2)
3. It remained unclear to me whether the focus of the article was on job characteristics or job resources. I think the study deals more with job characteristics. If the authors agree, they might want to revise the part on the JDR (page 1-2). If not, it might be a good idea to clarify differences between the literatures on job characteristics/job resources.

In the revised manuscript, our focus is on job satisfaction facets, which reflects satisfaction with various characteristics or aspects of job such as pay, benefits etc. As dropping the JD-R model from our discussion, we hope that this is now reemphasized throughout the manuscript.

Literature review:

4. P.4, lines 12-44: The part on the causality of the job satisfaction – work engagement relationship is not very convincing to me. The authors would need to make stronger theoretical arguments for the directionality. The authors refer to several studies that supposedly evidence for the directionality of the relationship. I would recommend to provide more details about these studies; that is a review about the empirical evidence for the directionality that is being claimed. I could even come up with theoretical arguments why the directionality should be reversed. Consider self-perception theory: When I see myself putting effort into my work, working late etc., I might think in turn that I must be satisfied with what I do.

Thank you for this comment. There is not a unified agreement on whether job satisfaction is an antecedent or outcome of the work engagement in the academic literature. Our perception is that satisfaction with various job satisfaction facets are the antecedents of work engagement. Drawing on SET, we argue that if employees are satisfied with various aspects of their jobs then they are more likely to be energetic, dedicated and absorbed (i.e. engaged) in their work. We now added additional explanation about why we think that job satisfaction is the antecedent of work engagement on Pages 4-5.

5. P.4, lines 46: The article relies upon the SET for making predictions. I would like to see at least a short introduction and explanation of the theory. The authors have included three sentences on the SET, on which they base their predictions. In addition, no reference
is made to the origin of the various SET models. I would recommend to clarify which SET the authors chose to base their predictions on, and to introduce the theory.

Thank you. We now included more discussion on SET on Pages 2; 5; 9-10; and 17.

6. P. 5, lines 22: From the review of the facets of job satisfaction, it remains unclear to the reader whether overall job satisfaction is a higher-order construct or an independent concept. There is a fundamental theoretical and empirical difference between the two. For instance, in the organizational justice literature, this has been tested (see Nicklin et al., 2014). This could be clarified in this literature review.

Thank you for this comment. In our study, we do not measure or create a higher-order job satisfaction construct. Our study focuses on each job satisfaction facet separately. In some studies, each facet is measured separately and used to create a higher-order overall job satisfaction construct. However, we did not do this in our study following the suggestions by Skalli et al. (2008) and Spagnoli et al. (2012), which argue that each facet has unique contributions to the meaning of job satisfaction.

7. P. 5, line 44 and Table 1: This is a point that created much confusion to me. The authors review the facets that Spector proposed and then show something very different to that in Table 1. It is unclear where the groupings come from. And also, perceived organizational support appears in the table. It very unclear why the authors did not stick to the Spector categorization. I see two options. One is to stick to the categorization of Spector. This would mean abandoning job autonomy and perceived organizational support. The other options is include all facets as in the current version of the manuscript. This would mean that the authors cannot claim their facets are in line with Spector. This would also mean that the authors have to provide much more information and arguments for their groupings and for their deviance from any other categorization of job satisfaction facets that exists, and to give much more details on the inclusion of job autonomy and perceived organizational support.
Thank you for this comment. We now revised our model and analyses following your suggestion. The model discussed and tested in the revised manuscript only focuses on the Job Satisfaction Facets defined by Spector (1997). This meant that we had to drop three variables: job autonomy, POS and performance recognition from the revised model. The details and scale items for the job satisfaction facets are summarised in Table 1.

8. While reading the theoretical part that leads to the predictions, I was wondering about the difference between the perception/availability of specific job characteristics (or job resources, depending on how the authors decide on my point 3), and the satisfaction with these job characteristics. In the theoretical part (page 5 to 12), the authors use studies made on the availability or perception of job characteristics as evidence for the satisfaction with these. For me there is a difference. This confusion of things is also mirrored in the items. The items by Spector reflect job satisfaction. Yet, for the predictions, the authors use evidence from studies on availability/perception of job characteristics. I would like the authors to make a difference between the two, or to make a stronger case that there is, in fact, no difference between perception/availability and satisfaction.

Thank you for this comment. The job satisfaction facets as suggested by Spector (1997) measured the satisfaction perceptions of employees with various aspects of their job. Thus, our study and results reflect perceptions, not the availability of each job satisfaction facets i.e. work, operation conditions, pay, benefits, rewards, promotion, co-workers, supervisors and communication.

9. P. 7-8: For the rewards part, the authors did not make use of the SET. I was puzzled by that. Is there a reason for not using SET for Hypothesis 2?

Thank you for this comment. This was an oversight on our part and now corrected. The SET is the theoretical model that is used and helps us to explain the link between each job satisfaction facet and work engagement.

Methodology:
10. I would like to see more details about the measure from Spector (1997) on the facets of job satisfaction. There are several versions of the JSS that I think is being used. On his homepage (see: http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jsspag.html), Spector put up the version he suggests to use. Is this the version that is being used in this article?

   Thank you. That is the scale we had measured in our survey to collect our data. To avoid any further confusion, we provided the details of JSS in Table 1.

11. Putting many similar, similar because they all measure satisfaction, concepts in one analysis is risky. Instead of in Table 2, I would like to see whether there is any collinearity in the regression analyses.

   Thank you. The multi-collinearity measures are now provided in Table 4. The explanation is also provided in the manuscript page 16.

12. The authors note that they have done CFAs for unidimensionality of the concepts. I would like to see the results of a CFA with all the satisfaction concepts. This would test whether all items load on their respective satisfaction factor, and whether all these factors are independent of one another. The authors could also test whether grouping the concepts (as proclaimed in Table 1) would provide a better fit. And the authors could test whether there is an overall job satisfaction factor emerging.

   Thank you. As we do not group facets, we are not providing CFA results. If you still would like to see them, please let us know and we will provide them (we were not sure if they were still needed).

13. It is unclear what the response scale for the items was.

   Thank you, this is now provided in the manuscript under the measured section. We have used: a 7-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree).
14. P. 14/15. Please indicate in the example items which items are reverse-coded. Also, for instance for ‘satisfaction with workload’, it is unclear what a high score means.

Thank you. As we follow JSS, this is now clearly indicated in Table 1.

15. Measure of job autonomy: It is unclear why job autonomy is measured as the availability of job autonomy and not as satisfaction.

Thank you. Job autonomy is not part of our revised model.

Analysis and results:

16. Please state whether H1 was supported.

Thank you, this is now provided on page 15.

17. I would like to see a small review and results section of the non-supported hypotheses (H3 and H5).

Thank you, this is now provided on pages 15-16 and 18-19. Please note that the hypotheses numbers are changed in the revised manuscript.

Discussion:

18. P17, lines 35: “.., none of the previous studies provided a systematic and complete reflection of job characteristics and discussed their impact on work engagement”. In my opinion, the authors do not do that either. To me, this is evidence for the confusion between job characteristics/job resources availability/perception versus satisfaction. If that was the goal, the authors could have taken social support, feedback, recognition, pay, growth, job autonomy, etc as job resources and then also job demands. But that is not what the authors have done, and therefore this should not be claimed.

Thank you. That previous discussion is now removed. Our revised discussion only focuses on job satisfaction facets and work engagement drawing from the SET.
19. The authors do not discuss the non-supported and negative findings – there were significant negative relationships where the prediction was a positive one. In my view, the authors should also try to discuss even the non-significant findings.

   Thank you. We now discuss the non-significant results in the analyses as well as discussion/conclusion sections.

20. Practical implications and future research paragraphs could be extended.

   Thank you. That is now done on pages 18-19.

Options for improvement:

21. I was thinking about how the authors could make a more compelling case. One option could be to combine the individual satisfaction scales to their groupings based on theory. This would have the advantage of potentially finding better results. Also, methodologically, this would be a better approach. Option two is to then also make differential predictions for the three different work engagement concepts. This could be done by having groupings of satisfaction scales (other people, reward, communication etc). This would have the advantage of making use of the three different work engagement components, making use of the groupings, and providing a more theoretical contribution to the literature.

   Thank you for this comment. As we originally measured JSS, we wanted to follow this scale and how it was measured. As you mentioned in across your comments, grouping or categorising these facets as job resources creates additional confusion. Therefore, we wanted test the impact of each facet separately.

Throughout the manuscript:

22. I found numerous English mistakes in the manuscript. I would encourage to involve a proof-reading service for any future submissions.

   Thank you. This is now done hopefully to your satisfaction.
23. At various points throughout the manuscript, the authors use very strong language, either to convey that causality is established, or that evidence is strong beyond any doubt. As is known, strong evidence is rare, and causality claims cannot be made from survey data.

   Thank you. This is corrected. We never meant to make causal inferences as it cannot be done.

24. The authors claim they have a longitudinal dataset. I disagree. Time 1 includes the independent variables, Time 2 includes the dependent variables. As a minimum for a longitudinal study, Time 1 dependent variables should be controlled for (Zapf et al, 1996). Therefore, the authors should not claim that they have a longitudinal study.

   Thank you. Instead of longitudinal, we now explain our data as cross-lagged.

Smaller issues:

25. P. 2, lines 41: “It the organizations would like to have engaged employees, then the employees first must be content that their needs related to their job and work environment are fulfilled”. I would question the “must” in that sentence. There many engaged employees whose needs are not fulfilled at all by their organization. For instance, nurses have typically bad working conditions, yet they are very engaged.

   Thank you. This previous statement is now removed.

26. P. 3, line 38: “employee engagement, … which is a continuous problem in todays’ organizations”. I suppose the authors mean that lack of engagement posits a problem.

   Thank you. Yes, we meant creating an engaged workforce is problematic.

27. P. 16, line 22: I suppose the authors mean “their relationship with job satisfaction and work engagement” instead of “POS”?
Thank you. This is now removed.

28. P.19, line 30: What is meant with “pat satisfaction”?

Thank you. This is now corrected as “pay”.

29. Tables have not always the same font (see Table 2, Table 3)

Thank you. That is still the case for Table 2 as otherwise we could not fit the table to a single page.

References:


Additional Questions:
<b>1. Originality: </b> Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Contributions are not specifically mentioned. There should be a stronger reliance on theory.

Thank you. The contributions are now reiterated in the introduction section on Page 2 and in the discussion/conclusion section pages 16-17.

<b>2. Relationship to Literature: </b> Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: The studies and works that are cited should be written about in more detail.
Thank you. We now expanded our discussion on SET, job satisfaction and work engagement, and the related studies.

3. Methodology: Is the paper’s argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: More information regarding measurement should be given. Data were assessed at two time points, but there is no control for baseline level of the dependent variables.

Thank you. More details about the scales and how they are measured are provided in the methodology section and Table 1. The data is defined as cross-lagged.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: I make several suggestions for analysing the data. Some results, for the not-supported hypotheses, are missing from the results section.

Thank you. This is now corrected.

5. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Practical implications and future research paragraphs could be extended.

Thank you. This is now corrected.

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal’s readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: The manuscript is clear to understand. There are, though, quite a few English mistakes that undermine readability.

Thank you. The final version is proof-read.